62

1932

தமிழ்நாடு சட்டமன்றப் பேரவை
TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

1610

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

THIRD SESSION OF THE FOURTH LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL LIBRARY 10 DEC 1934 MADRAS

Vol. LXII (Nos. 1 to 4.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Tuesday, the 2nd August 1932

	PAGES
Personnel of the Government of Madras	1–10
Members present	11–12
I. Swearing in of members	12
II. Address by His Excellency the Governor	12–15
III. Questions and Answers	15–50, 103–117
IV. Acts assented to by His Excellency the Governor	50
V. Panel of Chairmen	50
VI. Election of five members to the Senate of the Annamalai University.	51
VII. House Committee	51
VIII. Demands for Supplementary Grants for 1932–33 :—	
Grant VI—Irrigation (excluding Cauvery-Mettur Project)—Reserved	51–53
Grant XXI—Agriculture—Transferred	53–58
Grant XXIX—Civil Works—Transferred and Reserved	58
Grant XXXII—Famine Relief—Reserved	58–69
IX. The Orissa Committee Report	69–98
X. Papers laid on the table of the House	99–102, 118–155

Wednesday, the 3rd August 1932.

Members present	157–158
I. Questions and Answers	158–187, 244–245
II. House Committee	187

Non-official Business.

III. The Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill (Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar)	188–202, 213–243
IV. A Bill to amend the Madras Medical Registration Act, 1914 (Mr. Daniel Thomas)	202–205
V. A Bill to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920, and the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920 (Mr. F. Birley)	205–208
VI. A Bill to amend the Madras Impartible Estates Act, 1904 (Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo)	208
VII. The Kapileswarapuram Impartible Estates Bill (Mr. D. V. Narasimhaswami)	208
VIII. The Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill (Mr. R. M. Palat)	208
IX. The Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill (The Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri)	208

TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

		PAGES
X.	A Bill to amend the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920 (S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur)	209
XI.	The Kapileswarapuram Impartible Estates Bill (The Zamindar of Mirzapuram)	209
XII.	The Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill (The Zamindar of Kirlampudi)	209
XIII.	The Money-lenders Bill (Mr. C. Basu Dev)	209–210
XIV.	The Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill (Mr. K. Kesava Ramamurthi Nayudu)	210
XV.	The Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill (Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar)	210
XVI.	The Artisans' Bill (Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar)	210–211
XVII.	A Bill to amend the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920 (Mr. P. C. Moses)	211
XVIII.	The Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill (Mr. P. Madhusoodhanan Thangal)	211
XIX.	The Artisans' Bill (Mr. H. M. Jagannadham)	211
XX.	A Bill to amend the District Municipalities Act, 1920 (Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar)	211
XXI.	The Artisans' Bill (Pandit Ganala Ramamurthi)	211
XXII.	Resolution on matters of general public interest: Service of copyists and copyist-examiners in the Revenue courts	212–213
XXIII.	Papers laid on the table of the House	243

Thursday, the 4th August 1932.

Members present		247–248
I.	Questions and Answers	248–269, 329–330
II.	Act assented to by His Excellency the Governor-General	269
III.	The Orissa Committee Report	269–310
IV.	A Bill to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920 ..	311–315
V.	A Bill to amend the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920	315
VI.	A Bill to amend the Madras Services Commission Act, 1929	315–328
VII.	Election of five Members to the Senate of the Annamalai University.	328
VIII.	Paper laid on the table of the House	328

Friday, the 5th August 1932.

Members present		331–332
I.	Questions and Answers	332–359, 401–416
II.	Statement regarding the health of Mr. Subash Chandra Bose (a State prisoner)	359–360
III.	Statement regarding the alleged oppression of the depressed classes in the Devakottai subdivision	361
IV.	Alleged delay in answering questions put to Government	361
V.	The Orissa Committee Report—Elucidation of certain incidents that occurred on the previous day at division time	361–362

Non-official Business—Bill.

VI.	The Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill (Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar)	362–370
VII.	Resolutions on matters of general public interest— Service of copyists and copyist-examiners in the Revenue courts ..	370–375

		PAGES
VII.	Resolutions on matters of general public interest—*cont.*	
	Classification of Madigas, Chuckliyans, etc., as Arundhathiyas in Government records	376–377, 378
	Establishment of a Central Co-operative Artisan Bank	378–380
	Organization of a State lottery on the lines of the Irish Free State Lottery	380–395
	Cancellation of certain Government Orders regarding the distribution of discharged temporary employees in the Cauvery-Mettur Project among the regular circles of the Public Works Department	396–400
VIII.	Election of a member to the Senate of the Madras University	377
IX.	Appointment of Chairmen of Select Committees on certain Bills ..	377
X.	Papers laid on the table of the House	400, 416–420

TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

PERSONNEL OF THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

Governor of Madras.

His Excellency Lieut.-Col. the Right Hon. Sir George Frederick Stanley, P.C., G.C.I.E., C.M.G. Took his seat on the 12th November 1929.

Members of the Executive Council.

1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur, *Kt.*, Home Member. Took his seat on the 30th March 1925 and is in charge of the following portfolios :—

I.—Provincial Subjects.

1. Police, including Railway Police and C.I.D.
2. Regulation of betting and gambling.
3. Prevention of cruelty to animals.
4. Control of poisons.
5. Control of vehicles.
6. Control of dramatic performances and cinematographs.
7. Control of newspapers, books and printing presses.
8. Laccadives.
9. European vagrancy.
10. European and Anglo-Indian education.
11. Regulation of medical and other professional qualifications and standards.
12. Government Houses, Staff and equipment of His Excellency the Governor.
13. Government Presses.
14. Elections for Indian and Provincial Legislatures.
15. Industrial matters included under the following heads :—
 (*a*) Factories.
 (*b*) Settlement of labour disputes.
 (*c*) Boilers.
 (*d*) Gas.
 (*e*) Smoke nuisances.
 (*f*) Welfare of labour including depressed classes.
16. Criminal tribes.
17. Stores and Stationery (required for Reserved Departments).

II.—Central Subjects.

1. Control of petroleum and explosives.
2. Central police organization.
3. Arms and ammunition.
4. Emigration and immigration.
5. Pilgrimage to the Hedjaz.

2. The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar, *Kt.*, Law Member. Took his seat on the 25th April 1928 and is in charge of the following portfolios :—

I.—Provincial Subjects.

1. Administration of justice, including constitution, powers, maintenance and organization of courts of civil and criminal jurisdiction within the province.
2. Provincial law reports.
3. Administrator-General and Official Trustees.
4. Escheats.
5. Coroners.
6. Treasure-trove.
7. Non-judicial and judicial stamps.
8. Prisons and prisoners.

I.—Provincial Subjects—cont.

9. Industrial matters included under the following head: Electricity, including hydro-electric scheme.
10. Forests (including Cinchona) except panchayat forests.
11. Minor Ports.

II.—Central Subjects.

1. Civil law.
2. Inventions and designs.
3. Copyright.
4. Criminal law.
5. Major Ports.
6. Shipping and navigation.
7. Lighthouses.
8. Port quarantine and marine hospitals.

3. The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., C.B.E., V.D., I.C.S., Member in charge of Revenue. Took his seat on the 29th June 1929 and is in charge of the following portfolios:—

I.—Provincial Subjects.

1. Land Revenue administration as described under the following heads, namely:—
 - (*a*) Assessment and collection of land revenue.
 - (*b*) Maintenance of land records; survey for revenue purposes; records of rights.
 - (*c*) Laws regarding land tenures; relations of landlords and tenants; collection of rents.
 - (*d*) Court of Wards, encumbered and attached estates.
 - (*e*) Land improvement and agricultural loans.
 - (*f*) Colonization and disposal of Crown lands.
 - (*g*) Management of Government estates.
 - (*h*) Panchayat forests.
2. Yeomiahs, inams and hereditary pensions.
3. Water-supplies, irrigation and canals, drainage and embankments; water storage and water power.
4. Inland waterways including shipping and navigation thereon.
5. Economic condition including wages and prices and famine-relief.
6. Land acquisition, excepting notifications under sub-section (1) of section 4 and declarations under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, where the public purpose referred to in the said sub-sections appertains to a transferred subject.
7. Development of mineral resources.
8. Protection of wild birds and animals.
9. Pounds and prevention of cattle trespass.
10. Provincial gazetteers.
11. Agency tracts.
12. Fortnightly reports and preliminary special reports to the Government of India.
13. General service questions.
14. Office procedure.
15. Secretariat.
16. Matters of a general nature not allocated elsewhere.

II.—Central Subjects.

1. Geological survey.
2. Mineral development.
3. Botanical survey.
4. Survey of India.
5. Zoological survey.
6. Meteorology.
7. Census and Statistics.
8. Territorial changes.
9. Immovable property in possession of the Governor-General in Council.
10. All-India services.
11. Public Services Commission.
12. Reforms.

4. The hon. Mr. H. G. Stokes, C.S.I., C.I.E., I.C.S., Finance Member. Took his seat on the 19th March 1930 and is in charge of the following portfolios :—

I.—Provincial Subjects.

1. Provincial finance.
2. Pensions.
3. Local Fund audit.
4. Preservation and translation of ancient manuscripts.
5. Central Record office.

II.—Central Subjects.

1. (*a*) Defence of India.
 (*b*) Naval and Military works and cantonments.
2. External relations, including naturalization and aliens and pilgrimage beyond India except to the Hedjaz.
3. Relations with States in India.
4. Political charges.
5. Communications.
6. Posts and telegraphs and telephones, including wireless installations.
7. Sources of all-India revenues.
8. Currency and coinage.
9. Public debt of India.
10. Savings banks.
11. Indian Audit Department.
12. Commerce, including Banks and Insurance.
13. Trading Companies and other Associations.
14. Opium (Central questions regarding —).
15. Central Research.
16. Ecclesiastical.
17. Archæology.
18. Regulation of ceremonial titles, orders, precedence and civil uniform.
19. Subjects not allocated elsewhere.

Ministers.

1. The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu, Minister for Local Self-Government. Took his seat on the 27th October 1930 and is in charge of the following portfolios :—

1. Local Self-Government including village panchayats.
2. Medical administration.
3. Public Health and Sanitation and Vital Statistics.
4. Religious and Charitable Endowments.
5. Adulteration of food-stuffs and other articles.
6. Light and Feeder Railways and Tramways within municipal areas.
7. Stores and Stationery (required for Transferred Departments).

2. The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan, Minister for Public Works. Took his seat on the 27th October 1930 and is in charge of the following portfolios :—

1. Agriculture.
2. Civil Veterinary Department.
3. Public Works (Buildings, Roads, Ferries, Ropeways, etc.).
4. Co-operative Societies.
5. Registration.
6. Weights and Measures.

3. The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar, Minister for Education and Excise. Took his seat on the 27th October 1930 and is in charge of the following portfolios :—

1. Education (other than European and Anglo-Indian education).
2. Excise.
3. Development of Industries.
4. Fisheries.
5. Libraries, Museums and Zoological Gardens.
6. Pilgrimage within British India.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

President.

The hon. Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi.

Deputy President.

M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur G. Jagannadha Raju Garu.

Panel of Chairmen.

M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur A. T. Pannirselvam Avargal.
,, Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar Avargal.
,, M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar Avargal.
Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib Bahadur.

Secretary to the Council.

M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur R. V. Krishna Ayyar Avargal, B.A., M.L.

Assistant Secretary to the Council.

M.R.Ry. D. K. V. Raghava Varma Garu, B.A., B.L.

LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Name of member.	Name and class of constituency.
1. Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib Bahadur.	Madras City, Muhammadan Urban.
2. Ahmed Meeran Sahib Bahadur, Moulvi Hafeez Anumanthakudi Mustapha.	Ramnad *cum* Tinnevelly, Muhammadan Rural.
3. Alagannan Chettiyar, Rao Sahib A. S.	Madura, N.-M. Rural.
4. Alamelumangathayaramma, Mrs. K.	NOMINATED.
5. Annamalai Chettiyar, S. A. A.	Nattukottai Nagarathar's Association.
6. Arasu, V. T.	NOMINATED.
7. Ari Gowder, H. B. ..	The Nilgiris, N.-M. Rural.
8. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur R. N.	Central Districts, Indian Christian.
9. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.	Central Districts, Muhammadan Rural.
10. Basu Dev, C.	NOMINATED.
11. Bayappa Reddi, P.	Anantapur, N.-M. Rural.
12. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur, S. M. K.	Ceded Districts, Muhammadan Rural.
13. Bhanoji Rao, A. V.	NOMINATED.
14. Birley, Frank	Madras Chamber of Commerce.
15. Campbell, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., C.B.E., V.D., I.C.S., The hon. Sir Archibald.	EX OFFICIO.
16. Davis, O.B.E., J. A.	Anglo-Indian.
17. Devadasan, M.	NOMINATED.
18. Dharmalingam Pillai, Rao Sahib V.	NOMINATED.
19. Duraiswami Reddiyar, K. M.	South Arcot, N.-M. Rural.
20. Ellappa Chettiyar, Diwan Bahadur S.	Salem, N.-M. Rural.
21. Foulkes, R.	NOMINATED.
22. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur M.	Bellary, N.-M. Rural.
23. Harischandrudu Nayudu, A. ..	Godavari East, N.-M. Rural.
24. Hood, I.C.S., H. M.	NOMINATED.
25. Hutton, A. W.	European.
26. Indriah, C.	Godavari West, N.-M. Rural.
27. Jagannadha Raju, Rao Bahadur G. (*Deputy President*).	Vizagapatam, N.-M. Rural.
28. Jagannatham, H. M.	NOMINATED.
29. James, F. E.	Madras Planters.

Name of member.	Name and class of constituency.
30. Jayaram Nayudu, Rao Sahib C.	Chingleput, N.-M. Rural.
31. C. E. Jones, I.C.S.	NOMINATED.
32. Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu, K.	Cocanada City, N.-M. Urban.
33. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur P.	Madura and Trichinopoly *cum* Srirangam, Muhammadan Urban.
34. Kolanda Reddi, Rai Sahib C.	Kistna, N.-M. Rural.
35. Koti Reddi, K.	Cuddapah, N.-M. Rural.
36. Krishnamurti, Rao Sahib D. ..	NOMINATED.
37. Krishnan, C.	NOMINATED.
38. Krishnan Nayar, *Kt.*, The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M.	EX OFFICIO.
39. Krishnaswami Ayyar, *Kt.*, Diwan Bahadur Sir Alladi.	NOMINATED.
40. Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri (Raja Velugoti Sarvagnya Kumara Krishnayachendrula Bahadur Varu).	Nellore, N.-M. Rural.
41. Kumaraswami Reddiyar, The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. (*Minister*).	Tinnevelly, N.-M. Rural.
42. Kuppuswami Choudari, J. ..	Guntur, N.-M. Rural.
43. Lakshmana Reddi, G. ..	Anantapur, N.M.-Rural.
44. Luker, F. G.	Madras Trades Association.
45. Madanagopal Nayudu, R. ..	Madras City, N.-M. Urban.
46. Madhusoodhanan Thangal, P.	NOMINATED.
47. Maharaja of Venkatagiri (Sri Raja Velugoti Sir Govinda Krishna Yachendrula Bahadur Varu, K.C.I.E., Lieutenant-Colonel).	North Central Landholders.
48. Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur.	Northern Circars, Muhammadan Rural.
49. Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur.	South Kanara, Muhammadan Rural.
50. Manikkavelu Nayakar, M. A.	North Arcot, N.-M. Rural.
51. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur T. M.	Malabar, Muhammadan Rural.
52. Moses, P. C.	Northern Districts, Christian.
53. Muhammad Meera Ravuttar Bahadur, K. P. V. S. ..	Madura *cum* Trichinopoly, Muhammadan Rural.
54. Muniswami Nayudu, the hon. Diwan Bahadur B. (*Minister*).	Chittoor, N.-M. Rural.
55. Muniswami Pillai, Rao Sahib V. I.	NOMINATED.
56. Murugappa Chettiyar, Diwan Bahadur A. M. M.	Ramnad, N.-M. Rural.
57. Muthiah Chettiyar, M. A. ..	Southern India Chamber of Commerce.

Name of member.	Name and class of constituency.
58. Muthu Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur P. C.	Madura, N.-M. Rural.
59. Nachiyappa Gounder, K. A. ..	Salem, N.-M. Rural.
60. Nadimuthu Pillai, A. Pl. N. V.	Tanjore N.-M. Rural.
61. Nanjappa Bahadur, Subadar-Major S. A.	NOMINATED.
62. Narasa Reddi, T.	Cuddapah, N.-M. Rural.
63. Narasimhaswami, D. V. ..	Godavari East, N.-M. Rural.
64. Narayanan Nambiyar, V. P.	Malabar, N.-M. Rural.
65. Narayanaswami Pillai, Rao Bahadur T. M.	Trichinopoly, N.-M. Rural.
66. Natesa Mudaliyar, Rao Bahadur C.	Madras City, N.-M. Urban.
67. Palat, R. M.	West Coast Landholders.
68. Pannirselvam, Rao Bahadur A. T.	Tanjore and Trichinopoly *cum* Madura, Christian.
69. Parthasarathi Ayyangar, C. R.	Chittoor, N.-M. Rural.
70. Patnaik Mahasayo, Sriman M. G.	Ganjam, N.-M. Rural.
71. Patro, *Kt.*, Rao Bahadur Sir A. P.	Ganjam, N.-M. Rural.
72. Pattabhiramayya, K.	Kistna, N.-M. Rural.
73. Pattagar of Palayakottai (Rai Bahadur Nallathambi Sarkarai Manradiyar).	Coimbatore, N.-M. Rural.
74. Peddi Raju, P.	Godavari West, N.-M. Rural.
75. Pocker Sahib Bahadur, B. ..	Malabar, Muhammadan Rural.
76. Premayya, G. R.	NOMINATED.
77. Rajagopala Pillai, P. V. ..	NOMINATED.
78. Raja of Bobbili (Sri Ravu Swetachallapathi Ramakrishna Ranga Rao).	Vizagapatam, N.-M. Rural.
79. Raja of Kallikote (Raja Sri Ramachandra Marda Raja Deo Garu).	Northern Landholders, I.
80. Raja of Parlakimedi (Sri Sri Sri Krishna Chandra Gajapathi Narayana Deo Garu).	Ganjam, N.-M. Rural.
81. Rajan, The hon. Mr. P. T. (*Minister*).	Madura, N.-M. Rural.
82. Ramachandra Padayachi, P. K.	South Arcot, N.-M. Rural.
83. Ramachandra Reddi, The hon. Mr. B. (*President*).	Nellore, N.-M. Rural.
84. Ramakrishna Reddi, A. ..	Kurnool, N.-M. Rural.
85. Ramalingam Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur T. A.	Coimbatore, N.-M. Rural.
86. Ramamurti, Pandit Ganala ..	NOMINATED.
87. Raman Menon, K. P.	Malabar, N.-M. Rural.
88. Ramaswami Ayyar, T. S. ..	Madras University.
89. Ramaswami Mudaliyar, V. M.	North Arcot, N.-M. Rural.
90. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, A. ..	Bellary, N.-M. Rural.

Name of member.	Name and class of constituency.
91. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, G. ..	Tanjore, N.-M. Rural.
92. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, M. D. T.	Tinnevelly *cum* Palamcottah, N.-M. Urban.
93. Rangaswami Reddi, M. B. ..	North Arcot, N.-M. Rural.
94. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur C. S.	Coimbatore, N.-M. Rural.
95. Sahajananda, Swami A. S. ..	NOMINATED.
96. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti ..	Madras City, N.-M. Urban.
97. Satyanarayana Choudari, C. ..	Guntur, N.-M. Rural.
98. Sesha Reddi, B. P.	Kurnool, N.-M. Rural.
99. Shetty, A. B.	South Kanara, N.-M. Rural.
100. Simhachalam Pantulu, Gade ..	Guntur, N.-M. Rural.
101. Singam Ayyangar, K. ..	Trichinopoly *cum* Srirangam, N.-M. Urban.
102. Siva Raj, Rao Sahib N. ..	NOMINATED.
103. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar, K. S.	Tanjore, N.-M. Rural.
104. Slater, C.M.G., C.I.E., I.C.S., S.H.	NOMINATED.
105. Smith, C.I.E., I.C.S., E. Conran.	NOMINATED.
106. Soundara Pandian, W. P. A.	NOMINATED.
107. Sreshta, M. S.	West Coast, Christian.
108. Srinivasa Ayyangar, T. C. ..	Ramnad, N.-M. Rural.
109. Srinivasan, Rao Bahadur R. ..	NOMINATED.
110. Sriramulu, G.	NOMINATED.
111. Stanes, F. G.	Madras Chamber of Commerce.
112. Stokes, C.S.I., C.I.E., I.C.S., The hon. Mr. H. G.	EX-OFFICIO.
113. Subbarayan, Dr. P. ..	South Central Landholders.
114. Subrahmanyam Chetti, Rao Sahib P.	NOMINATED.
115. Subrahmanya Bhatt, U. C. ..	Kanara South, N.-M. Rural.
116. Sundara Rao Nayudu, T. ..	Madras City, N.-M. Urban.
117. Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur, Khan Sahib.	Tanjore, Muhammadan.
118. Thomas, Daniel	Ramnad *cum* Tinnevelly, Christian.
119. Thorne, C.I.E., I.C.S., J. A. ..	NOMINATED.
120. Usman Sahib Bahadur, *Kt.*, The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed.	EX-OFFICIO.
121. Vasudeva Pillai, V. G. ..	NOMINATED.
122. Vedachala Mudaliyar, M. ..	Chingleput, N.-M. Rural.
123. Venkatarama Ayyar, K. R. ..	Madura City, N.-M. Urban.
124. Venugopal Nayudu, Rao Bahadur R. K.	South Arcot, N.-M. Rural.
125. Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur.	East Coast, Muhammadan Rural.
126. Yakub Hasan Sahib Bahadur.	North Arcot *cum* Chingleput.
127. Zamindar of Bodinayakkanur (Kamaraja Pandia Nayakar, T.V.K.).	Southern Landholders.

Name of member.	Name and class of constituency.
128. Zamindar of Chemudu (Sri Vyricherla Narayana Gajapati Raju).	Vizagapatam City, N.-M. Urban.
129. Zamindar of Ettayapuram (Raja Jaga Veera Rama Kumara Venkateswara Ettappa Nayakar Ayyan).	Tinnevelly, N.-M. Rural.
130. Zamindar of Kirlampudi (Sri Raja Ravu Ramakrishna Ranga Rao).	NOMINATED.
131. Zamindar of Minampalli (K. C. M. Venkatachala Reddiyar).	Trichinopoly, N.-M. Rural.
132. Zamindar of Mirzapuram (Mirzapuram Raja alias Venkataramayya Appa Rao).	Northern Landholders, II.

SPECIAL MEMBERS.

133. Appu Nayar, P.	NOMINATED for the consideration of the Nambudri Bill and the Marumakkattayam Bills.
134. Newcomb, Lieut.-Col. Clive ..	NOMINATED for the consideration of the Bill to amend the Madras Medical Registration Act, 1914.

TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF THE GOVERNOR OF MADRAS.

OFFICIAL REPORT.

Third Session of the Fourth Legislative Council under the Government of India Act, 1919.

Tuesday, the 2nd August 1932.

The House met at eleven of the clock, Mr. President (the hon. Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI) in the Chair.

PRESENT :

Usman Sahib Bahadur, *Kt.*, The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed.
Krishnan Nayar, *Kt.*, The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M.
Archibald Campbell, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., O.B.E., V.D., I.C.S., The hon. Sir.
Stokes, C.S.I., C.I.E., I.C.S., The hon. Mr. H. G.
Muniswami Nayudu, The hon. Diwan Bahadur B.
Rajan, The hon. Mr. P. T.
Kumaraswami Reddiyar, The hon. Diwan Bahadur S.
Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib Bahadur.
Ahmed Meeran Sahib Bahadur.
Alamelumangathayaramma, Mrs. K.
Arasu, Mr. V. T.
Ari Gowder, Mr. H. B.
Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur R. N.
Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.
Basu Dev, Mr. C.
Bayappa Reddi, Mr. P.
Beyabani Sahib Bahadur, S. M. K.
Bhanoji Rao, Mr. A. V.
Birley, Mr. F.
Davis, M.B.E., Mr. J. A.
Dharmalingam Pillai, Rao Sahib V.
Ellappa Chettiyar, Diwan Bahadur S.
Harischandrudu Nayudu, Mr. A.
Hood, I.C.S., Mr. H. M.
Hutton, Mr. A. W.
Indriah, Mr. C.
Jagannadha Raju, Rao Bahadur G.
Jagannatham, Mr. H. M.
James, Mr. F. E.
Jayaram Nayudu, Rao Sahib C.
Jones, I.C.S., Mr. C. E.
Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu, Mr. K.
Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur.
Kolanda Reddi, Rai Sahib C.
Koti Reddi, Mr. K.
Krishnamurti, Rao Sahib D.
Krishnan, Mr. C.
Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri, The
Kuppuswami Choudari, Mr. J.
Lakshmana Reddi, Mr. G.
Luker, Mr. F. G.
Madanagopal Nayudu, Mr. R.
Madhusoodhanan Thangal, Mr. P.
Maharaja of Venkatagiri, The
Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur.
Manikkavelu Nayakar, Mr. M. A.
Moidoo Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur T. M.
Moses, Mr. P. C.
Muniswami Pillai, Rao Sahib V. I.
Muthiah Chettiyar, Mr. M. A.
Muthu Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur P. C.
Nachiyappa Gounder, Mr. K. A.
Nadimuthu Pillai, Mr. A. Pl. N. V.
Nanjappa Bahadur, Subadar-Major S. A.
Narasa Reddi, Mr. T.
Narasimhaswami, Mr. D. V.
Narayanaswami Pillai, Rao Bahadur T. M.
Natesa Mudaliyar, Rao Bahadur C.
Palat, Mr. R. M.
Pannirselvam, Rao Bahadur A. T.
Parthasarathi Ayyangar, Mr. C. R.
Patnaik Mahasayo, Sriman M. G.
Patro, *Kt.*, Rao Bahadur Sir A. P.
Pattagar of Palayakottai, The
Peddi Raju, Mr. P.

PRESENT:—*cont.*

Pocker Sahib Bahadur, B.
Rajagopala Pillai, Mr. P. V.
Raja of Bobbili, The
Raja of Kallikote, The
Ramalingam Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur T. A.
Ramamurti, Pandit Ganala.
Raman Menon, Mr. K. P.
Ramaswami Ayyar, Mr. T. S.
Ramaswami Mudaliyar, Mr. V. M.
Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. A.
Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. M. D. T.
Rangaswami Reddi, Mr. M. B.
Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur C. S.
Sahajanandam, Swami A. S.
Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, Mr.
Satyanarayana Choudari, Mr. C.
Sesha Reddi, Mr. B. P.
Shetty, Mr. A. B.
Simhachalam, Mr. G.
Singam Ayyangar, Mr. K.
Siva Raj, Rao Sahib N.
Slater, C.M.G., C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. S. H.
Smith, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. E. C.
Sreshta, Mr. M. S.
Srinivasan, Rao Bahadur R.
Sriramulu, Mr. G.
Stanes, Mr. F. J.
Subbarayan, Dr. P.
Subrahmanya Chetti, Rao Sahib P.
Subrahmanya Bhatt, Mr. U. C.
Sundara Rao Nayudu, Mr. T.
Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur, Khan Sahib.
Thomas, Mr. Daniel.
Thorne, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. J. A.
Vedachala Mudaliyar, Mr. M.
Venkatachala Reddiyar, Mr. K. C. M. (Zamindar of Minampalli).
Venugopal Nayudu, Rao Bahadur R. K.
Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur.
Zamindar of Chemudu, The
Zamindar of Kirlampudi, The
Zamindar of Mirzapuram, The

I.—SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

The following Members made the prescribed oath or affirmation of allegiance to the Crown and took their seats:

Mr. F. J. STANES.

Mr. C. E. JONES, I.C.S.

M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur A. T. PANNIRSELVAM Avargal.

Mr. P. PEDDI RAJU.

II.—ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

His Excellency the GOVERNOR then addressed the Council as follows:—

"Mr. President and hon. Members of the Legislative Council,—Since the last meeting of the Council the three Committees which visited this country at the beginning of the year have issued their reports, but the only one to which I intend to refer at the moment is that of the Franchise Committee. I am glad to say that it accepted in the main with slight alterations the proposals put forward by this Government. Those proposals, though perhaps not going so far as some people may have wished, will greatly extend the franchise in this Presidency and the Franchise Committee described them as a well thought-out and balanced scheme. For this we are very greatly indebted to the Chairman and Members of the Provincial Franchise Committee, to whom I once again offer the best thanks of the Government for their careful consideration of the difficult problem which confronted them.

"We have also had the statement of the Secretary of State on the procedure which His Majesty's Government propose to adopt in order to expedite the passage into law of the Bill which will confer further reforms on this country and I regret very much that in one important

2nd August 1932]

particular this proposal has caused dissatisfaction. In this connexion I may give the reasons why I have disallowed a resolution which it was proposed to move in this Council to the effect that the procedure outlined by the Secretary of State is not acceptable to Indian opinion. I have done so because in my opinion it is not primarily the concern of this Government but of His Majesty's Government and of the Government of India, who have been clearly informed by responsible leaders that the new procedure is not acceptable to them. I naturally therefore do not intend to discuss it myself, but I must own that I have been greatly influenced in my decision by the opinion that I hold very strongly that, once it has been made clear—as it has been—that the proposal does not meet with favour, the less said the better at this particular juncture when all efforts are being directed, and I hope will be successfully directed, towards finding some way out of the present difficulty. I do not think, however, that I shall be transgressing if I say that I am quite sure we are all agreed in hoping that it will be possible to find a solution which will satisfy Indian opinion and which will at the same time secure the object aimed at by His Majesty's Government, viz., to expedite the passing of the Bill which will usher in a new era in this country. If I may be allowed to make a personal reference, I am particularly anxious that this should be so, as ever since I entered on my present office I have always cherished the hope that it might be my privilege to inaugurate the reforms here and see them working satisfactorily in this Presidency, where at any rate I am confident they will be operated for the good of the Presidency and of its inhabitants.

"The ordinances which have been in force since the beginning of this year were due to expire early last month, and we have considered it necessary to renew some of them. My Government and I would willingly and gladly have let them lapse if we had felt we could do so with safety. But, so long as a certain section of the people persist in carrying on the civil disobedience movement with all its senseless futility, we could not hold ourselves justified in not retaining the ordinances. It is not that they have been extensively used in this Presidency—the figures of convictions under them show they have not—and they are only aimed at those who are determined to create such a situation as would be the worst possible condition under which the new reforms would start. I must point out that, however far-reaching the new reforms may be, they would be seriously handicapped from their very inception if the idea were to get abroad that law and order need not be respected, and my Government and I are determined that we will not leave to the future responsible Government of this Presidency a legacy to the effect that a small minority of the people can with impunity defy the Government of the day, which defiance would, if successful, speedily lead to a condition of chaos and of anarchy.

"I regret to have to say that in parts of the Bellary district a difficult situation has arisen owing to the failure of the monsoon last year in that district. So far the rainfall has been promising this year and meantime steps are being taken to deal with the situation which will I trust be effective in preventing any very great measure of distress.

[2nd August 1932

" The monsoon this year was late, but reports from the districts show that so far it has not been unfavourable; and, though one cannot yet take a very rosy view of the general economic situation, I believe prices have been steady and it is possible to take at any rate a less pessimistic, though still far from optimistic, view of the prospects than would have been possible some weeks ago. The general desire displayed at Lausanne to come to some agreement on the subject of war debts and reparations must have a good effect on the world's economic conditions, and I trust that India will receive a full share of any improvement that may take place.

" Hon. Members are doubtless aware that a committee met early this year to discuss the question of the advisability of the formation of a separate province of Orissa and whether in such a case certain portions of Madras should be transferred to the new province. That committee has now made certain recommendations, and an opportunity will be given to hon. Members to express their opinions on the reasonableness or otherwise of those recommendations. The Government trust that hon. Members will give them the benefit of their advice on this subject, which may have far-reaching consequences, so as to enable them, when making representations as they will have to do on this question, not only to give their own view of the advisability of the proposed transfer but also to give the considered opinion of the Madras Legislative Council.

" There is one question to which I desire to refer although it is for the moment, and will probably for some years to come, be merely of academic interest. But it seems to me to be a question that must ultimately arise and will then be of great importance, and I therefore mention it to you now for your consideration.

" There are, as you know, two principal methods by which a parliamentary majority may be formed—the Party system and the Group system. The former prevails in Great Britain and in America, and the latter is predominant in France and to a lesser extent in Germany. The main difference, as I see it, between the two systems is that in the Party system the leader—so long as he is the leader—has the right to expect unswerving loyalty and support from his party; in the Group system the leader has to satisfy the various groups that compose the party in order to enlist their support. It would appear then theoretically that the former system ensures a more stable government, and I believe I am correct in saying that it is so in actual practice. The question that I now put before you is whether the Party or the Group system will ultimately prevail in this Presidency. As the people of the Presidency get more political consciousness, will political questions cut across caste and creed, or, will caste and creed predominate over political questions? That is a question that I am of course utterly incompetent to answer, and I venture to think that you, Gentlemen, also would not care to prophesy what the future may bring forth in this connexion. But it is a question that is likely to be fraught with such far-reaching consequences for the Presidency when it does arise that I make no apology for bringing it to your notice now—academic though I have already said

2nd August 1932]

it may be at the moment. Whatever may be the result, I hope and believe that this Council will always bear in mind that the Members are not in the Council for their own advancement but are returned to serve the interests of those they represent. So long as that is the standard that Legislative Councillors put before themselves, I have no fear but that Madras will continue to show to the rest of India how provincial autonomy should and can be carried out."

III.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS

Law and Order—General

Alleged beating of three picketers under the orders of the Circle Inspector of Police, Mangalore.

* 1 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt: With reference to question No. 1117, answered on 24th March 1932, regarding three picketers beaten by the Mangalore Police on 10th February 1932 for picketing Messrs. R. B. Vasant & Co., will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state— 11-15 a.m.

(*a*) whether the further report called for as to why it was necessary to inflict so many blows has been received by the Government; if so, whether the hon. the Home Member will be pleased to place on the table a copy of the first as well as the further report;

(*b*) whether the crowd that assembled to watch the beating was an unlawful assembly and why it was ordered to disperse;

(*c*) after the crowd showed disposition to disperse as stated in the answer why the picketers were beaten and that so severely; and

(*d*) what action the Government have taken or propose to take against the officers that have used such excessive force?

A.—(*a*) The report has been received. Both this and the previous report are confidential; so it is not proposed to place them on the table of the House, but the required information is given below.

(*b*) The unlawful assembly consisted of the picketers and volunteers prepared to assist them who failed to disperse after being warned.

(*c*) A section of the crowd took up a defiant attitude even after being warned to disperse. They were therefore dispersed with light canes. Some members of the unlawful assembly sustained injuries, but none of the injuries was serious. The attitude of the section of the crowd which refused to disperse was such that considerable force had to be used.

(*d*) Instructions have already been issued that force should not be used in excess of the requirements of the situation. It is for the officer on the spot to decide what amount of force is necessary to effect dispersal. The need for discretion in the use of force has been impressed on all officers.

[2nd August 1932

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—"In answer to the question it is stated that the crowd that gathered became menacing, etc. May I ask, Sir, on what authority that statement is made. Generally when these picketers go out, there is usually a big crowd merely watching them. But does that become an unlawful assembly? I believe, Sir, in law there must be a common object for an unlawful assembly."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"The statement has been made on the authority of the District Magistrate who has reported to the Government after making due enquiry."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I ask what the nature of the enquiry made was?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"After enquiring the people who were there and the police officers, he has made the report to the Government."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"It is stated in answer to clause (b) that the unlawful assembly consisted of the picketers and volunteers prepared to assist them. May I know how before any overt act was committed by those who were present there the police came to know of their unlawful object?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"As I have said, that is from the report of the District Magistrate."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"May I know whether the report says anything as to the preparations made to assist the volunteers?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"Yes. That is a fact, Sir."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—"In answer to clause (c), it is stated 'a section of the crowd took up a defiant attitude even after being warned to disperse.' May I know what it means?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"The Police asked them to disperse. But they would not. They abused the police and became turbulent and vociferous."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I say that I did not ask what the Police thought of the crowd?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"My hon. Friend wanted to know what the meaning of the statement was, and what I have said is from the report of the District Magistrate."

Alleged police excesses on picketers at Mangalore.

* 2 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt: With reference to question No. 1118 answered on 24th March 1932, will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government received the information called for;
(*b*) what the information is; and

2nd August 1932]

(c) what action the Government have taken or propose to take in the matter?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The number of beatings was not recorded and it is not possible to furnish information at this distance of time. The nature of the wounds was contusions and stick marks. No picketer fell down unconscious as a result of the beating. The picketers were removed to the Hospital by the police.

(c) None.

Alleged beating of two volunteers by the Police in Mangalore on 26th March 1932.

* 3 Q.—Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether two volunteers Babu Shetti and Subbayya Shetti picketed on 26th March 1932 the foreign yarn shop of Ganesh Srinivasa Pai in Mangalore and whether the Police formed a cordon round the volunteers and beat them with canes;

(b) under what provision of law the two volunteers within the police ring were beaten by the police; and

(c) whether it is a fact that two volunteers Subbayya Shetti and Vaikunta Shirianna picketed the shop of D. Kanji Bros. at Mangalore on the same date and were severely beaten by the police?

A.—(a) The two persons mentioned picketed a foreign yarn shop on 26th March 1932. The picketers and the crowd that had collected were warned by the Police to disperse. The two persons received some cuts from canes but no cordon was formed round them.

(b) The picketers were not beaten within a Police ring.

(c) The volunteers picketed the shop referred to and a crowd collected. They were warned to disperse and on refusal to disperse they received some cuts from canes.

Alleged beating of two volunteers for picketing the shop of D. Kanji Bros. on 6th April 1932.

* 4 Q.—Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that only two volunteers picketed the foreign cloth shop of D. Kanji Bros. on 6th April 1932 at 4-30 p.m. in Mangalore town;

(b) whether it is a fact that the Police came in their van headed by the Circle Inspector and Sub-Inspector of Police and beat the picketers with canes;

(c) whether it is a fact that the Police van was placed between the picketers and the main portion of the road;

[2nd August 1932

(d) whether it is a fact that between the van and the shop of D. Kanji Bros. there were no persons on the public road except the picketers and the Police men;

(e) whether it is a fact that the passers-by who stopped on the public road after the beating commenced were about 50 yards away from the picketers;

(f) whether it is a fact that they were given 10 or 12 severe beatings by the cane;

(g) whether they showed the least signs of violence or retaliation; and

(h) what action the Government have taken or propose to take in the matter?

A.—(a) Two picketers picketed the foreign cloth shop with six other volunteers and some on-lookers standing nearby.

(b) The Police warned the assembly to disperse, but the volunteers and picketers did not move. They were therefore dispersed with light canes.

(c) No. The van was kept near the Wenlock Hospital compound wall.

(d) The facts reported are otherwise.

(e) When the Police arrived and warned the crowd of on-lookers to disperse they moved on and stopped about 50 yards away, except the picketers and volunteers.

(f) One picketer had ten cuts and the other had fourteen. The beatings were not severe. The picketers were discharged immediately after they were sent to the hospital.

(g) They showed a determined disobedience to the orders of the Police to desist from committing the offence.

(h) None.

Alleged Police excesses in South Kanara.

*5 Q.—Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt: With reference to question No. 1237 answered on 24th March 1932, will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) what action has been taken with reference to the complaints against Police excesses at Kanhangod on 11th February 1932 and other places made by some of the leading vakils of Kasaragod;

(b) whether any enquiry was held into the same; if so, who were all the persons that were examined; and

(c) whether any of the complainants were examined or were given any opportunity to adduce evidence; if not, why not?

A.—(a) The letter from the vakils of Kasaragod, a copy of which was laid on the table of the House on 24th March 1932 with reference to clause (a) of question No. 1237 makes three main allegations and they are answered below:—

(1) At Kanhangod on 11th February 1932 a crowd numbering about 50 gathered to watch the picketing. The picketers and the crowd were

ordered to disperse and refusing to do so were dispersed by force. No person was beaten who was not a member of the crowd at the time it was dispersed and no person was singled out for attack. V. Chatukutti Nayar who was then the "dictator" of the Kasaragod Taluk Congress Association and Madhavan Nayar, a Congress volunteer, were among the picketers.

(2) At Pilicode on 11th February 1932 Naraina Adiodi was beaten during the course of a forcible dispersal but was not beaten into unconsciousness when at some distance from the crowd. He was a few yards away when the dispersal began but then advanced as though to encourage the picketers. He was warned to go away but defied the order and was therefore dispersed together with the rest. He subsequently feigned unconsciousness but was able to get up and go away after a very short interval. Harishwaran Tirumumbu was not singled out and chased away but was a member of the crowd that was dispersed. No person of the name of Madhavan Nayar was beaten at Pilicode but a person of that name was among the crowd dispersed by force at Kanhangod on the same day. He was not intentionally struck on the head.

(3) It is not the case that the injured were left unattended where they fell. While the Inspector was arranging to have those who had fallen removed to the hospital they got up one by one and walked away. Nobody was seriously injured, as canes and not lathis were used to disperse the crowds.

(*b*) & (*c*) If any person was prepared to substantiate a complaint, it was open to him to prefer a complaint in court. In the absence of any individual complaint, the District Magistrate did not examine any complainant, but satisfied himself that the allegations were incorrect or exaggerated.

Alleged beating of three persons at the Washermanpet police station lock-up on 3rd April 1932.

*6 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have received a statement signed by Manicka Nayakar, M. Kulshekar Nayakar and V. Krishnaswami Nayakar stating that they were beaten by the Police in the Washermanpet Police station lock-up on 3rd April 1932;

(*b*) whether the Government held any enquiry on the same; if so, who the persons examined were and what the result is of the said enquiry; and

[2nd August 1932

(c) whether any opportunity was given to the complainants to be present at the time of the enquiry and give their own statement or adduce other evidence?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) No statement was received by the Government. The Government obtained a report on seeing the statement published in *Swarajya* and found the allegation about beating in the Police lock-up to be totally false. The persons mentioned with the crowd that collected were dispersed after warning, but they were not taken to the Washermanpet Police station or beaten there.

Alleged cruelty on the part of the Police at Robertsonpet, Masulipatam.

* 7 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether he has received a letter from Sjt. P. Ghanta Reddi complaining that himself and J. Pattabhi Ramayya were taken by the Police of Robertsonpet Police station, Masulipatam, on the 27th March 1932 to the said Police station and that the Police beat Pattabhi Ramayya and that Mr. Ghanta Reddi who was taken to the lock up, was kicked on the chest and back by the Police and also beaten, and that one head constable spat on his face; if so, whether he will be pleased to place a copy of the same on the table of the House;

(b) whether any enquiry was held on the same; if so, whether the said complainant was examined or any statement was taken from him or any opportunity was given to him to be present at the time of the enquiry and adduce evidence; and

(c) what action the Government have taken or propose to take in the matter?

A.—(a) Yes. A copy[a] of the letter is placed on the table of the House.

(b) & (c) The District Magistrate has made such enquiry as he found necessary. It was open to the two persons mentioned to complain to the District Magistrate, if they were prepared to substantiate the facts alleged. If they have not done so, the Government do not propose to take any further action.

Alleged detention of three ladies in unlawful custody by the Ellore Police.

* 8 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that Srimathi Mudumbi Venkatamma, Javaj Rajaratnamma, Maddula Damayantamma, were arrested on the 18th March in Ellore for distributing Congress pamphlets and released on 2nd April 1932;

[a] Printed as Appendix I on page 103 infra.

2nd August 1932]

(*b*) under what provision of law the Police arrested them and kept them for such a length of time in the sub-jail without their being charge-sheeted and brought before the Sub-Magistrate for trial;

(*c*) in whose custody were the said ladies during their detention; and

(*d*) what action the Government have taken or propose to take in the matter?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) On 18th March 1932 the three persons were found exhorting students in the Ellore High School compound to take part in Congress activity, and distributing Congress leaflets. They were arrested for having committed an offence under section 17 (1) of the Indian Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1908, and remanded to custody pending investigation by the Police as to who had instigated them to commit the offence and as to the origin of the Congress leaflets. Investigation showed that these persons were of minor importance and were merely tools in the hands of others. It was therefore decided not to prosecute them. They were released on 2nd April 1932 within the period of 15 days remand permissible under section 167, Criminal Procedure Code, for purpose of Police investigation.

(*c*) They were under custody in the Sub-Jail, Ellore.

(*d*) None.

Search of the Khadi depot of the Andhra branch of the All-India Spinners Association at Nidadavole.

* 9 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Police searched the premises and the Khadi depot of the Andhra branch of the All-India Spinners Association at Nidadavole; and

(*b*) whether they seized any account books, and if so, what books, how many, and why; and whether they have been since returned; if not, why not?

A.—The Government have no information but have called for it.

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know whether the information called for has not yet been received by the Government?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"No, Sir."

Alleged handcuffing of Congress volunteers under arrest.

* 10 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether two Congress volunteers Basappa and Mahabala Alva who were arrested by the Police of Mangalore in about March were

[2nd August 1932

cited as witnesses in Mr. B. Venkappa Rai's case which was pending before the Subdivisional Magistrate, Mangalore; if so, whether they were brought to the Subdivisional Magistrate's Court and handcuffed; and

(*b*) whether it is a fact that on the very same date, i.e, 28th March some other prisoners undergoing trial in the Sessions Court of Mangalore for murder were brought to the Sessions Court from the same jail; if so, whether it is a fact that they were not handcuffed?

A.—(*a*) The facts are as follows:—

On 28th March 1932 two Police constables were escorting the prisoners, Mahabala Alva and M. Basappa, one convicted and the other an under-trial, from the sub-jail to the Court of the Subdivisional Magistrate, Mangalore. On the way some persons collected shouting 'jais' and attempted to garland M. Alva. On account of this demonstration and more particularly because the prisoners refused to move, the escort grew anxious and, lest they should escape, handcuffed them for a short distance. As they were approaching the Court the handcuffs were removed. The prisoners were not handcuffed when they were taken back to the sub-jail, as there was no demonstration.

(*b*) It is reported that the murder case prisoners were handcuffed when being taken from the sub-jail to the Sessions Court on the same day.

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—" May I know if it is the crying of 'jais' by the people and attempting to garland Mr. Alva that resulted in the handcuffing of the prisoners? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—" The Police thought that the crowd gathered there would help the prisoners to escape."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—" Because a crowd gathered, what reason is there for the Police to think that the prisoners will escape? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—" The crowd showed sympathy with the prisoners and naturally it was thought that they would assist the prisoners in getting out of the Police custody."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—" Is it that, when a crowd gathers, the prisoners ought to be handcuffed? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—" When it was found there was a chance of the prisoners escaping from custody, they were handcuffed."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—" Is it reported that the prisoners attempted to escape? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—" There was a chance of escaping."

2nd August 1932]

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I ask whether it is laid down in the rules anywhere that, if the prisoners refused to move, they should be handcuffed?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:— "No laying down of any rule is necessary. It is commonsense to guard against prisoners escaping."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"When the prisoners refuse to move, is it commonsense that the prisoners should be handcuffed?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:— "I have nothing to add to what I have already said."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"If the prisoners are unable to move, what is the use of handcuffing them?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:— "There was a big crowd and it was necessary to secure the prisoners."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Is it because of the crowd they were handcuffed?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:— "The prisoners had a chance of escaping from custody."

Date of the addendum to the extract from the Police Gazette *regarding the use of lathis.*

* 11 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: With reference to the answer to question No. 1254, answered on 24th March 1932, will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state the date on which the addition of the last paragraph beginning with "add the following at the end of the section, etc." restricting the scope of the main body of instructions to formidable mobs, was made in the *Police Gazette*, dated the 2nd August 1930?

A.—6th February 1932.

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"May I know whether it is not a fact that till the 6th of February 1932, when the amendment was made, the order of the Government to use minimum force was not given effect to and the order of the Inspector-General of Police, as contained in the *Police Gazette* to use maximum force and that on the face and neck and head was in continuance?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:— "The order was there, but it was not put to any practical use."

Prisons and Prisoners

Proposed shifting of the office of the Inspector-General of Prisons to Madras.

* 12 *Q.*—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether there is any proposal before the Government to shift the office of the Inspector-General of Prisons to Madras; and

(*b*) if so, when the Government propose to give effect to the same?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) The proposal is still under consideration.

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I know when the Government will finish their consideration of this proposal? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" I am sorry that it is not possible to give a definite answer to that question."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I know whether Government has been able to find out any building in the City and, if so, which building has been found for this purpose? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" That is one of the difficulties which the Government now have."

Retrenchment in the Jail department.

* 13 *Q.*—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) what the full scope and effect of the retrenchment effected by the Government in the Jail department is;

(*b*) which are the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee that have been accepted and which have not been accepted; and

(*c*) what the reason is for not accepting the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee, if any ?

A.—(*a*) The hon. Member is referred to tables A, B and C in Appendix III to the report of Madras Retrenchment Committee, 1931-32. The Alipuram Jail, Bellary, has since been closed.

(*b*) All the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee have been accepted.

(*c*) Does not arise.

Desirability of abolishing the post of the test auditor for the Jail department.

* 14 *Q.*—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether there is any test auditor for the Jail department or any section thereof;

(*b*) if so, what his duties are, and what the pay drawn by him is;

(*c*) what the travelling allowance drawn by him is during each of the last five years;

(*d*) what the reason is for there being no independent audit of the accounts of the Jail Department by the General Audit and Accounts Department; and

(*e*) whether the Government or the Retrenchment Committee have examined the question of abolishing the Test Auditor, and if so, with what result ?

2nd August 1932]

A.—(*a*) No.

(*b*), (*c*) & (*e*) Do not arise.

(*d*) There is regular audit of the accounts of the Jail Department conducted by the Accountant-General's Audit staff.

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" May I know whether it is a fact that an officer of the Jail department goes out from jail to jail checking the accounts before the accounts are really submitted to the regular Audit department? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Notice, Sir."

Food-rations supplied to ' B ' class prisoners in Vellore jail.

* 15 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to any complaint from ' B ' class prisoners in the Vellore Central Jail regarding the food-rations supplied to them?

A.—No.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY :—" May I know if the hon. the Law Member has not received any complaint with regard to the rations supplied to B class prisoners? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" No, Sir."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" May I ask whether these prisoners are being allowed butter-milk? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Yes, it is not butter-milk but curds."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" May I know whether one prisoner, Dr. Lakshmidevamma, complained about the food given? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I am not aware of it."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" Was any petition submitted to the hon. the Law Member about it? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I do not remember."

Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR :—" Will the Government make an enquiry in the matter? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" If my hon. Friend, Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, says there is a petition, I shall enquire."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Will B class prisoners be allowed to get what are necessary in the interests of their health according to the advice of the medical officer, at least with their own money? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" No."

[2nd August 1932

Putting of a wire-knitted screen between prisoners in Vellore Jail and the interviewing persons.

* 16 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that in the Vellore Central Jail, political prisoners have recently refused to interview their relatives as a protest against the putting of a wire-knitted screen between them and the interviewing persons; and

(*b*) whether such screens have been put in the interview rooms in other jails also and, if so, since when and for what reasons?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government have no information.

Mr. A. B. Shetty:—"May I know why the Government did not get the information?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—"Because it was thought unnecessary."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—"Have they still not got the information?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—"If my hon. Friend wants it, I shall get the information."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—"May I know whether wire-knitted screens are put in between prisoners and those interviewing them?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—"It is about this that I have said that the Government have no information."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—"The question is whether the prisoners refuse to interview because of the wire-knitted screen, and the Government reply is that they have no information. I want to know whether the practice of wire-knitted screen is being put up when convicts seek interviews?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—"The Government have no information on that point either."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"May I know if the purdah system which is dying out is being introduced in the jails?"

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—"May I know if Government instructed the Superintendents of Jails to guard these interviews?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—"There are standing rules relating to interviews."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—"Has there been any occasion to ask the Superintendents to observe them more strictly?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—"Notice, Sir."

2nd August 1932]

Employment of machinery for Jail industries.

* 17 *Q.*—Mr. F. J. STANES: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) the value of the outturn of jail industries in this province per year;

(*b*) the method adopted in fixing the selling price of jail produce; (Is it, for example, fixed after consultation with the Director of Industries?);

(*c*) what allowances are made in the costing of jail produce for—

(1) daily payment of labour,
(2) overhead charges;

(*d*) what is the policy of Government with regard to the introduction of machinery in jails in view of universal overproduction and the fact that the introduction of machinery in jails leads to definite increase of unemployment; and

(*e*) what percentage of jail labour trained in industrial occupations follows those occupations on discharge in civil life?

A.—(*a*) The value of articles manufactured in all the jails of the Presidency during 1931 was Rs. 10,36,911—vide Statement XII-B (Financial) appended to the Jail Administration Report.

(*b*) & (*c*) The prices of jail-made articles are fixed in accordance with rules 987, 988 and 988-A of the Jail Manual. Only in regard to dispute in the matter of prices between the Jail department and the consuming departments of Government the opinion of an expert officer of the Industries department is obtained.

(*d*) The policy adopted by Government is that laid down by the Indian Jails Committee, viz., "Familiarity with power-driven machinery is instructive and mind awakening and provision of such machinery subserves the true functions of the jail administration while at the same time it increases production and tends to give increased relief to the tax-payer and it is therefore from all these points of view justifiable, but it should be employed in well established and organized industries and care should be taken to avoid any interference with nascent or unorganized industrial enterprises." This policy has been reiterated by the Government of India, the Madras Retrenchment Committee and the Jail Industries Committee.

(*e*) The Government have no information.

Mr. F. J. STANES:—"With reference to the answer to clause (*e*), will the Government consider the possibility of making enquiries from non-official agencies, as it one of the matters of policy laid down in the Indian Jails Committee Report?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I am afraid that the labour involved in the preparation of statistics and making enquiries will be out of all proportion to the benefits that are likely to be derived from the enquiries."

Mr. F. E. JAMES:—"Is the hon. Member aware that in Bengal, in the Punjab and in Bombay this very thing which my hon. Friend, Mr. Stanes, suggested is being carried out most extensively?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I am not aware."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"With reference to the answer to clauses (b) and (c), may I know whether disputes have not arisen in the matter of prices between the Police department and the Jail department?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"No dispute has arisen with reference to prices."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know whether any matter of dispute has arisen with regard to quality?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Yes, with reference to quality only."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know whether the price is not consistent with the quality and thus whether the dispute does not relate indirectly to price?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"It may be. But the dispute is not regarding price."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"What orders have Government passed on the matter?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"The Government held a conference in which the Inspector-General of Police and the Inspector-General of Prisons took part, and certain conventions were reached."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask what the nature of the complaint of the Police department is?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"That the quality is not of the required standard."

Shipping and Navigation

Amount of quay dues earned by the Madras Port Trust.

* 18 Q.—B. POCKER SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether during the year 1931–32 the Landing Agents of the Madras Port were remunerated at the rate of Rs. 2 per ton for cargo landed by boats and Re. 1 per ton for cargo landed directly on the quay;

(b) whether in previous years the rates were the same for both kinds of cargo;

2nd August 1932]

(c) whether during 1931–32 the percentage of directly landed cargo has decreased, and if so, why;

(d) how many steamers can be accommodated in quay berths simultaneously;

(e) whether any steamer is over-kept in moorings and cargo landed from there, in spite of the fact that a quay berth is available for it;

(f) whether it is a fact that even from steamers at the quays, cargo is allowed to be landed into boats so that the Landing Agents would be enabled to earn Rs. 2 per ton instead of Re. 1; and

(g) what is the average rate of quay due per ton earned by the Madras Port Trust on cargo landed in the port during the year 1931–32?

A.—As the hon. Member is aware the Local Government are merely the Agents of the Government of India in regard to this matter.

It is presumed that the question relates only to cargo to which the consolidated landing charge is applicable.

(a) & (b) Yes.

(c) & (f) There has been a slight decrease in 1931–32 in the cargo landed direct on to the quay as compared with 1930–31, but an increase when compared with 1929–30 and a large increase over 1928–29. The landing of cargo is a matter under the control of the steamer agents. Cargo is frequently landed on to the quay on one side and into the boat on the other so as to expedite discharge.

(d) Four general cargo steamers and three coal steamers.

(e) This may happen as the occupation of quay berths is mainly controlled by shed accommodation.

(g) Approximately 4 annas 10 pies.

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I ask whether the Local Government have addressed the Government of India regarding the administration of the Port Trust in this matter of quay dues? If so, with what result?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—"The Local Government are not their own masters in this matter except with reference to certain minor and unimportant details."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"May I know what part the Local Government plays in fixing the quay dues?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—"Ordinarily they accept the recommendations of the Port Trust Board in such matters."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"May I know whether the attention of the hon. the Law Member has been drawn to the fact that there is a great agitation to decrease the quay dues?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—"My attention has not been called to it."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I know whether it is the function of the Local Government as the Agents of the Government of India to consider policies enunciated by the Harbour Port Trust regarding the labour employed by it?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—"The Local Government is only the Agent of the Government of India and does not consider questions of policy."

Irrigation

Settlement of the dispute regarding the anicut at Ramasagar.

* 19 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to make a statement as to how the dispute between the ryots of the Madras and His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Governments with reference to the anicut at Ramasagar, Hospet taluk, Bellary district, has been settled, and if it has not yet been settled, the progress made in the negotiations towards settlement?

A.—It was agreed between His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Government and this Government that an Irrigation Engineer of each Government should meet at the site, discuss the question and submit a joint report with a view to an amicable settlement of the dispute. The joint report is awaited.

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"Have the Madras Government appointed their representatives?"

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"Yes."

The Kothapalli tank.

* 20 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state with reference to G.O. Ms. No. 679 I., dated 7th March 1928—

(*a*) the progress, if any, made in the carrying out of the scheme for improving the Kothapalli tank, Rayadrug taluk, Bellary district; and

(*b*) if the work has not yet been taken up, why and when it is likely to be taken up?

A.—(*a*) No progress has been made.

(*b*) The scheme is one of those which depend on the Hagari; the consideration of all schemes on the Hagari has been postponed till a decision is arrived at about the Tungabhadra project.

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"May I know at what stage the consideration of Tungabhadra Project is now?"

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"As I have on previous occasion informed the Council the Tungabhadra Project is the subject of negotiation with the Hyderabad Government as well as with the Bombay Government and the Mysore Government."

2nd August 1932]

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"Have the Nizam's Government asked the Madras Government for any papers regarding the project?"

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"They have asked for information from time to time and it has been supplied as far as possible."

Chintalapalli Project.

*21 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state the reasons for the delay in the execution of Chintalapalli Project, Hadagalli taluk, Bellary district, and when the project is likely to be taken up for execution?

A.—The Chief Engineer has recently submitted a preliminary report and an approximate estimate for a scheme costing about Rs. 2·65 lakhs and has asked for special staff for a more detailed investigation of the scheme. The question is under the consideration of Government. It is not possible to say now when the scheme is likely to be taken up for execution.

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"May I ask roughly what return the project is expected to give according to the preliminary report?"

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"I am sorry I cannot say off-hand."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"Are the Government likely to sanction the staff required for investigation?"

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"The examination in the Secretariat is nearly completed; I hope that orders will be passed in a few days."

Construction of a culvert to the supply channel from the Hagari river to the Kanekal tank.

*22 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the supply channel from the Hagari river to the Kanekal tank, Rayadrug taluk, Bellary district, cuts the cart-track which is the chief means of communication to many villages and for carts attending the weekly shandies of Kanekal near Adiganihalli, and renders the crossing of the channel near the said village, very difficult and dangerous; and

(*b*) whether it is proposed now or in the near future to bridge the channel at the site referred to above by a small culvert?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government have not the information but have called for a report.

[2nd August 1932

Construction of a culvert in the cart-track leading from Veparalla to Kanekal.

* 23 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the cart-track leading from Veparalla and other villages to Kanekal and certain other villages, crosses the supply channel leading to Kanekal tank near Veparalla and whether the use of this cart-track during rainy season at the spot where it crosses the channel is difficult and dangerous; and

(*b*) whether it is proposed by the Government, now or in the near future, to construct a small culvert at the spot in question?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government have not the information but have called for a report.

Land Revenue Administration

Preference to Probationary Revenue Inspectors for appointment as Deputy Tahsildars.

11-30 a.m. * 24 *Q.*—Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state whether in making appointments to the posts of Deputy Tahsildars, persons who have been directly recruited as Probationary Revenue Inspectors are given preference; and, if not, why they are not given such preference?

A.—The attention of the hon. Member is drawn to the answer to clause (*b*) of question No. 1079 asked at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 22nd March 1932.

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"May I know whether Government will issue instructions that persons who had been recruited as probationary revenue inspectors are to be given preference when appointments to the deputy tahsildars' posts take place?"

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"No."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"May I know whether there are any particular reasons prevailing with the Government for not issuing such instructions?"

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"There are no reasons for issuing such instructions."

Relief to people in areas affected by cyclone in Malabar.

* 25 *Q.*—Mr. R. M. Palat: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government are aware that the cyclone which passed over Malabar towards the end of last May has inflicted great loss on certain parts of the district; and

2nd August 1932]

(*b*) what measures the Government have taken or propose to take to give relief to the people in the affected areas?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) Copies [a] of the reports from the Collector of Malabar, dated 27th May 1932 and 15th July 1932, are annexed.

Famine relief in Bellary district.

*26 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of works in progress in the Bellary district at the time the Government ordered that the provisions of the Famine Code should apply to the carrying out of works of the cultivators and others in the district;

(*b*) the nature and kind of work and the place at which each was in progress;

(*c*) the average number of men, women and children employed during each of the four weeks prior to the stoppage of the work;

(*d*) the works since started according to the provisions of the Famine Code with particulars as to the nature of work, place and the number of men, women and children employed in each week in the month following the starting of the work; and

(*e*) the average wage paid to each man, woman and child before and after the change introduced by the Government?

A.—(*a*) Twenty.

(*b*) A statement [b] giving the information is attached.

(*c*) The average figures cannot be worked out without a good deal of labour. The actual number of workers reported on certain dates is as follows:—

Date.	Men.	Women.	Children.	Total.
27th April 1932 ..	5,948	9,562	3,527	19,037
4th May 1932 ..	5,514	8,617	2,993	17,124
12th May 1932 ..	1,833	3,021	899	5,753
19th May 1932 ..	2,972	4,745	1,528	9,245

† Figures incomplete.

(*d*) A statement giving particulars of the works is attached. The average daily attendance in each week was as follows:—

Week ending	Men.	Women.	Children.	Total.	
10th June 1932 ..	..	..	..	4,015	‡
17th June 1932 ..	..	..	..	7,744	‡
25th June 1932 ..	3,186	5,770	1,700	10,656	
2nd July 1932 ..	3,308	6,503	2,123	11,934	
9th July 1932 ..	3,758	7,233	2,421	13,412	

‡ Details not available.

[a] Printed as Appendix II on pages 103—106 infra.

[b] Printed as Appendix III on page 106 infra.

[2nd August 1932

(*e*) The rates of wages paid daily before the introduction of test works were:—

	RS.	A.	P.
For each man	0	3	0
For each woman	0	2	3
For each child	0	1	6
		or	
	0	1	0

The rates of wages payable on test works are given in the Famine Code. The rates are as follows for certain prescribed outturns. The actual amounts earned by the individual worker will depend on his or her outturn.

Workers.	Rate as increased under section 130 (*a*) (ii) of the Famine Code. RS.	A.	P.
Special class (i.e., gangmen or special gangs) ..	0	1	11
Class I (adults employed on digging, etc.) ..	0	1	7
Class II (adults employed on carrying, etc.) ..	0	1	3
Class III (children)	0	0	11

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask what the wages paid are after the departmental works were closed?"

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"The hon. Member has given me an opportunity of making a personal explanation. The rate paid to a worker in class I is 2 as. 1 p. if he does his full task. The figures in the answer have been based on calculations made in the Secretariat. The rates may vary from time to time with the price of grain."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"May I understand that 2 as. 1 p. just mentioned by the hon. Revenue Member is exclusive of the extra percentage allowed with reference to the prices of condiments?"

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"Yes."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask of the hon. Member to obtain the actual rates of wages paid?"

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"I have telegraphed for them and will place the figures on the table of the House when received."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Have these people been earning this all along or is it only recently this rate was introduced?"

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"I am under the impression that it has been the rate for a long time."

2nd August 1932]

Damage by cyclone in Kasaragod taluk.

* 27 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that owing to the unprecedented gale and rain vast tracts of cultivated land have been washed off or filled with mud and stones due to heavy land slides in the villages of Belur, Pullur and others in Kasaragod taluk;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that pattadars of the villages affected have made representations to the District Magistrate and the Board of Revenue praying that relief may be given to them in the matter of remissions of assessment; and

(*c*) what action the Government have taken or propose to take in the matter?

A.—(*a*), (*b*) & (*c*) The Government have no information but have called for a report.

Procedure for the inspection of the records of the Village Panchayats by Revenue Officials.

* 28 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the records of the village panchayats should be inspected by Revenue officials in the panchayat village and at the Panchayat office; and

(*b*) if so, the action taken by the Government in the case of the officials, if any, who summoned the panchayat presidents to come to their office or camps though they might be at varying distances from the panchayat villages, with their records for inspection?

A.—Not necessarily. The records should be inspected as near the village concerned, as the revenue officer's convenience permits.

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—" May I ask whether the Government will be pleased to revise their orders to the effect that the Revenue officials should go to the panchayat offices for the purpose of inspecting their records instead of summoning them to their camps with all the records? "

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—" I shall consider the hon. Member's suggestion."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—" Is the panchayat president an honorary or paid officer? "

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—" He is an honorary officer."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—" Does he get conveyance allowance for carrying the records? "

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—" I must ask the hon. Member to address the question to the Minister in charge of Local Self-Government."

[2nd August 193.

Construction of a Thangal in S. No. 153/1 of Melchangam village.

* 29 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) the terms of the order on which the construction of a Thangal in S. No. 153/1 of Melchangam village in Chengam taluk was permitted by the authorities in 1909; and

(*b*) whether the terms of the order have been adhered to in recent years and if not, why not?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government have no information. A report has been called for.

Local Self-Government

Rural Reconstruction Supervisors.

* 30 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state the names of the local bodies that have so far appointed Rural Reconstruction Supervisors for village improvement work and the amount of subsidy, if any, sanctioned by the Government to assist such local bodies or other private agencies doing similar work?

A.—No information is available as to the names of the local bodies that have appointed Rural Reconstruction Supervisors. Apart from the grants sanctioned for the improvement of rural water-supply and village communications no grants are sanctioned specifically for the village improvement work.

Measures for the reduction of infant mortality in the Nandyal Municipality.

* 31 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state the measures taken by the Government to reduce the rate of infant mortality which, in 1928–29, rose from 123 to 198 per thousand births in the Nandyal Municipality?

A.—It is the duty of a Municipal Council to take steps to reduce the high rate of infant mortality in its area. When in 1928–29 the Government noted the increase of the rate of infant mortality in the Nandyal Municipality, they requested the Council to take prompt steps to bring it down. The figures for the subsequent years show that infant mortality has been steadily decreasing and that the Council has adopted measures calculated to bring down the high rate.

Measures for the relief of congestion in Nandyal Municipality.

* 32 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government granted any land for the relief of congestion and extension of the town of the Nandyal Municipality, and if so, when; and

2nd August 1932]

(b) whether the municipality divided the land into numerous house-sites and sold them to prospective builders of houses, and if so, the number of sites sold during each of the years since the grant of the plot, the amounts for which they were sold, and the sums actually collected during each year up to date?

A.—A report [a] on the subject received from the Chairman, Municipal Council, Nandyal, is placed on the table.

Action taken on the memorandum from the Indian Roads and Transport Development Association, etc.

* 33 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether a copy of the memorandum presented to him by the Indian Roads and Transport Development Association and several other associations on 21st March 1932 will be placed on the table of the House; and

(b) whether the matter has been considered by the Government and any steps taken to help 'bus trade in this Presidency'?

A.—(a) A copy [b] is placed on the table.
(b) The matter is under consideration.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—"May I know when the Government expect to arrive at a decision in regard to this matter?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"As the House knows a Committee was appointed to consider the question of bus licence fees and that Committee has appointed a Sub-Committee to go into the question. We are awaiting its report."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Has the Advisory Committee of the Local Self-Government made any recommendation in this matter?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"They are awaiting the report of that Sub-Committee."

Medical Administration

Appointment of L.I.M.'s to dispensaries under the local bodies.

* 34. *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) the steps the Government have taken to ensure the appointment of qualified L.I.M.'s to dispensaries under the control of local bodies in preference to unqualified practitioners; and

(b) whether any, and if so, how many local bodies have contravened such instructions, if any, issued by the Government and the action taken by them to enforce compliance with those instructions?

[a] Printed as Appendix III-A on page 107 infra.
[b] Printed as Appendix IV on pages 108—114 infra.

[2nd August 1932

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) Government have permitted local boards to appoint, wherever they choose to do so, Licentiates in Indian Medicine of the Government Indian Medical School, Madras, to be in charge of rural dispensaries subsidised by Government. No orders have however been passed by Government compelling local bodies to appoint L.I.M.'s in dispensaries, the expenditure of which is wholly met by them. No local body has contravened the instruction regarding the appointment of L.I.M.'s to subsidised rural dispensaries. The question of registering practitioners of Indian Medicine and prohibiting the appointment of practitioners, who are not registered, as medical officers in any institution of Indian Medicine maintained or aided by the State or local bodies or both is under the consideration of Government.

Religious and Charitable Endowments

Districts without temple committee.

* 35 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state the districts which at present have no temple committees working in them and the periods they have been without such committees respectively?

A.—A statement [a] is appended showing the districts in which temple committees are not functioning at present and the dates on which the terms of the committees which were functioning previously expired. No temple committee has been constituted for the Malabar district until now.

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"Practically the whole Presidency is without any temple committees. How is the work being carried on?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—"I am afraid I am not responsible for that. The hon. Member is aware that, when he was Minister, these committees went on functioning through nomination. Subsequently I had to consult the Advocate-General, in view of a doubt thrown upon that by the High Court of Madras and the Advocate-General gave his opinion that we could not constitute a committee filling it by nomination. Under another Act passed by this House, the Board has power to look after committee temples also. Proposals to constitute committees otherwise than by a direct electorate are now under consideration."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"How long has the hon. Minister been in charge?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—"I may state the proceeding that was started by the previous Minister was continued by me, and the Advocate-General advised me that we had no power in that matter."

[a] Printed as Appendix V on pages 114–115 infra.

[2nd August 1932

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—"We wanted to introduce one, but there are still some matters on which some consultation is necessary."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I know whether it is the opinion of the Government that temple committees as contemplated under the Act have not been constituted on account of financial reasons?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—"Yes."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—"May I know whether in the case of any of the temple committees which had its election list ready and which applied for permission for election Government have refused permission?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—"No, Sir. In Tanjore, Tinnevelly and South Arcot, elections were held and the elected committees are now functioning. We have not turned down the request of any committee."

Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar:—"Why are not committees elected in Madura, Coimbatore, Trichinopoly and some others, where I believe they have money?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—"The committees could not be constituted by election."

Agriculture

Development of the cultivation of fruits and vegetables.

* 36 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have taken any steps to develop the cultivation of fruits and vegetables for the market as suggested by the Royal Commission on Agriculture;

(*b*) whether any horticultural research is being done by the Department of Agriculture in this Province; and

(*c*) whether any course of training in fruit culture or in the preservation of fruits and vegetables is given at the Coimbatore Agricultural College?

A.—(*a*) A scheme has been submitted to the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research for financial help for opening a fruit research station in the plains; a survey of fruit cultivation and marketing in the Central Districts has been recently started and measures to help the export of plantains to Northern India are receiving attention.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) Lectures on fruit culture are given at the College where an orchard is maintained for instructional purposes. The study of preservation of fruits and vegetables has not yet been taken up by the Department.

2nd August 1932]

Mr. A. B. Shetty:—" May I ask the hon. Minister whether the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Agriculture regarding the cultivation of fruits and vegetables have ever been considered by the Government?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" Yes."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—" With regard to (b), may I know whether any special officer has been deputed for the purpose?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" No special officer has been deputed."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—" As this is a very important section of agriculture, why have not Government appointed a special officer for this purpose?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" No funds to appoint one."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—" With regard to the latter part of the answer to (a), may I ask what is being done in the matter of marketing?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" I may say, Sir, that the Director of Agriculture has said that he would depute one of the officers of his department and he would also write to the Directors of Agriculture in other provinces in that matter."

Mr. K. Koti Reddi:—" What steps do the Government propose to take to improve the cultivation of fruits?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" Experiments in cultivation have been done at some stations. Nothing has been done so far as marketing is concerned."

Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder:—" May I know why this Government does not think in the lines of other Governments in other Provinces who are helping the ryots in the matter of marketing?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" I am not aware of things being done by other Governments. Whatever is possible by this Government will be done."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—" May I know whether free advice is made available to the ryots who are interested in cultivation of fruits from the department of Agriculture?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" Certainly. If any advice is sought, the department is prepared to give it."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—" Free of cost?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" Yes."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—" May I know whether there is any officer in that department who can be called an expert in fruit culture?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" I do not think any one can be called an expert."

[2nd August 1932

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I ask what is the nature of the advice given?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"There are officers in the department who know something about fruits; but as I said, they are not experts."

Registration

Opening of a new Sub-registry Office at Perdal.

* 37 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether any sub-registry offices have been closed in Malabar this year; and

(*b*) whether the Government propose to open a new office at Perdal in South Kanara?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) No.

Mr. A. B. Shetty:—"May I know whether representations have not been made time and again regarding this matter?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"I am not aware of it."

Mr. A. B. Shetty:—"May I know whether representations were made to the hon. Minister when he visited South Kanara?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"That was three years ago."

Veterinary

Closure of Veterinary dispensaries.

* 38 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of veterinary dispensaries that have been closed this year as a measure of retrenchment; and

(*b*) the number of touring billets that have been abolished for effecting retrenchment?

A.—(*a*) Four.

(*b*) Six.

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"May I know whether the Government means to say that some schemes came up and they were pending and have all been disposed of?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar:—"No, Sir."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"Do I understand him correctly—I say that no schemes were ever sent up?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar:—"No scheme ever reached the Government."

2nd August 1932]

Education

Introduction of compulsory elementary education in Salem and South Arcot districts.

* 39 *Q.*—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) in how many areas of the South Arcot and Salem districts has compulsory elementary education been introduced, and what they are;

(*b*) how many proposals for the introduction of compulsory education from the municipal and local authorities in the districts of Salem, South Arcot and Coimbatore are pending before the Government for sanction; and

(*c*) what they are, and when the Government propose to dispose of them?

A.—(*a*) In none of the areas in the districts.

(*b*) None.

(*c*) Does not arise.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS

Prisons and Prisoners

Classification of Mr. B. Krishnaswami Mudaliyar as a 'C' class prisoner.

40 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. RANGASWAMI REDDI: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) what the rules are that are observed in classifying the prisoners convicted on account of Civil Disobedience Movement as A, B and C classes;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that B. Krishnaswami Mudaliyar of Arni in the district of North Arcot was arrested on the 15th February 1932 on account of the Civil Disobedience Movement and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year and placed in 'C' class; and

(*c*) whether the hon. the Law Member has been pleased to enquire into the position of the prisoner before classification?

A.—(*a*) The rules relating to classification of convicts will be found in the Press Communiqué No. 219, dated 19th March 1930, published on pages 456–458 of Part I of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 25th March 1930.

(*b*) Yes: except that the convict was in addition sentenced to pay a fine of Rs. 100 or in default to undergo rigorous imprisonment for six weeks.

(*c*) Yes.

Alleged ill-treatment of women in Vellore Jail.

41 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. RANGASWAMI REDDI: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the jail authorities in the Vellore jail remove the *kumkum* from the forehead of married women who are confined in that jail, and if so, the authority under which they are so acting; and

[2nd August 1932

(*b*) whether it is a fact that only two meals are given for C class prisoners, one between 12 noon and 1 p.m. and another between 4 and 5 p.m., and that children are not given anything till 12 noon?

A.—(*a*) The answer to the first part of the question is in the negative and that to the second part does not arise.

(*b*) The hon. Member is referred to rules 347 and 836 (3) of the Madras Jail Manual.

Famine Relief

Economic distress in the Bellary district.

42 *Q.*—Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have been receiving reports from local officers about the seasonal conditions in the Bellary district;

(*b*) whether the Government are aware of the prevalence of acute agricultural distress in the taluks of Bellary and Alur and parts of Siruguppa and Rayadrug;

(*c*) how long do they expect to continue the present test which has already been tried beyond the required period of fifteen days;

(*d*) whether the attendance during the test stage has not justified the conversion of these works into relief works;

(*e*) what the wage earned per day is in every one of the camps by a man, woman and child during test stage; and

(*f*) whether the Government will be pleased to lay on the table the reports of the Collector and the Famine Commissioner on the economic distress in the district immediately before the test stage?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to paragraph 1 of the Press Communiqué[a] issued on 29th June 1932, a copy of which is appended. The Government are aware that there has been a failure of crops in the area mentioned; the reliefs detailed in the Press Communiqué and the opening of test works are measures taken by the Government to meet the situation.

(*c*) & (*d*) The hon. Member is referred to the concluding portion of the Press Communiqué issued on 29th June 1932. No period of 15 days has been specified as the maximum for a test-work.

(*e*) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to clause (*e*) of question No. 26.

(*f*) The Government received a report under section 46 (*a*) of the Famine Code from the Commissioner of Land Revenue and Settlement but consider it unnecessary to lay it on the table of the Legislative Council.

[a] Printed as Appendix VI on pages 115–117 infra.

2nd August 1932]

Relief works in Bellary district.

43 *Q.*—Diwan Bahadur M. GOPALASWAMI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Famine Code applies when only a few taluks of a district in a presidency are affected;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that in 1926–27 on the representations of the then Collector, Mr. Crofton, the Famine Code was held inapplicable in such a situation;

(*c*) whether the same view was adopted for the first five months this time when about 20,000 labourers were employed upon making useful roads and drinking wells and ponds with a living wage of 3 annas to 1 anna;

(*d*) what the recommendations were of the Famine Commissioner who visited the camps in the Bellary district several times during these five months;

(*e*) why were his recommendations and those of the Collector and of the president, district board, turned down and the test works started which ought to have been initiated at the very beginning if there was an idea of application of Famine Code;

(*f*) how many relief camps were working before test stage and how many were closed when test works were ordered;

(*g*) what the wage that is earned by a man, a woman and boy or girl during the test stage is;

(*h*) what the cost is of running a camp at the test stage and what the cost was of running it before the test stage; and

(*i*) now that the test has been submitted to and people have been flocking to camps why there is delay in converting them into relief works?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) No. The hon. Member, as President, District Board, Bellary, suggested in 1927 that instead of opening famine camps, grants might be made to the District Board in order to carry out certain works for the employment of labour. Mr. Crofton supported the suggestion.

(*c*) The method of providing employment that was adopted in 1927 was adopted this year up to the last week of May.

(*d*) The Commissioner of Land Revenue and Settlement visited the district in February and May and made various recommendations.

(*e*) The hon. Member is referred to paragraph 4 of the Press Communiqué issued on 29th June 1932, which gives the reasons for the change in the system. Under section 33-A of the Famine Code, the Collector, if he considers that the measure of unemployment on account of adverse season is likely to be serious and to lead to distress, should, among other things, move the local boards to expand their programme of ordinary works. If the preliminary measures do not materially improve the outlook, he should open test works. The procedure adopted by the Government was in no way at variance with the provisions of the Famine Code.

[2nd August 1932

(*f*) There were no famine relief camps before the test works were opened; if the hon. Member is referring to the works carried on as an expansion of ordinary works he is referred to the answers to clauses (*b*) and (*d*) of question No. 26.

(*g*) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to clause (*e*) of question No. 26.

(*h*) The Government have not the information.

(*i*) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to clause (*c*) of question No. 42.

Land Revenue Administration

Appointment of outsiders as Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars in Anantapur district.

44 *Q.*—Mr. G. Lakshmana Reddi: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that outsiders have been imported into the Anantapur district as Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars; and

(*b*) whether the Government have received any representations to the effect that the prospects of the officers of the Revenue subordinate service in the district have consequently suffered?

A.—(*a*) The Government have not the information.

(*b*) No.

Enumeration of livestock in this Province.

45 *Q.*—Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state in detail the method or methods employed in enumerating the livestock of this province and the steps taken to ensure that they allow of no inaccuracies creeping into the statistical records?

A.—The attention of the hon. Member is drawn to the instructions for preparing Village Account No. 21 and the form of that account contained in the "Revised Forms of Village Accounts." Usually Village Officers are assembled at convenient centres in advance of the quinquennial census and the instructions in the Manual are explained to them by Revenue Officers.

Public Service

Age-limit of Viswabrahmans for entry into public service.

46 *Q.*—Pandit Ganala Ramamurti: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether any decision has been arrived at with regard to raising the age-limit of the Viswabrahmana community from 25 to 30 years for entry into Government service;

2nd August 1932]

(*b*) whether any proposal was sent to the Government by the Madras Services Commission that unless the age-limit of Viswabrahman candidates was raised from 25 to 28 years for appearing before the Services Commission Examinations it would be impossible to provide proper representation of the community in public services; and

(*c*) the orders of the Government regarding the same?

A.—(*a*) No such question has been considered.

(*b*) No.

(*c*) Does not arise.

Local Self-Government

Memorial from the employees of Mangalore Municipality regarding contribution to their provident fund.

47 *Q.*—Mr. M. S. Sreshta: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether he has received any memorial from the employees of the Mangalore municipality on the subject of contribution to their provident fund;

(*b*) whether the point raised involves any legal difficulties;

(*c*) whether the Government have obtained legal opinion and, if so, with what result;

(*d*) what other action, if any, has been taken on the memorial; and

(*e*) whether any and, if so, what orders have been passed thereon?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) & (*c*) No.

(*d*) & (*e*) As the Government cannot permit any deviation from the Provident Fund Rules issued in a statutory form, the memorialists were informed that their request cannot be complied with.

Publication of annual statistics regarding cow slaughter.

48 *Q.*—Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government are proposing to instruct municipalities to give statistics regarding cow slaughter in their annual administration reports; and

(*b*) if not, why not?

A.—(*a*) No.

(*b*) The Government do not consider that any public purpose would be served by calling for the information.

Slaughter of cattle beyond municipal and cantonment limits.

49 *Q.*—Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state the approximate number of cows and bullocks slaughtered every year in the areas beyond municipal and cantonment limits?

A.—The Government have no information.

[2nd August 1932

Resolutions by municipalities regarding prohibition of cow slaughter.

50 *Q.*—Mr. K. SINGAM AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) the names of such municipalities in this Presidency that have passed resolutions prohibiting cow slaughter or restricting slaughter of milch cattle in their prime age;

(*b*) whether they have been allowed to carry out the resolutions by Government without any check; and

(*c*) if not, the reasons therefor?

A.—(*a*) Resolutions on the subject passed by the following municipal councils came to the notice of Government:—

1. Anakapalle.	6. Guntur.
2. Masulipatam.	7. Nellore.
3. Coimbatore.	8. Erode.
4. Bezwada.	9. Palacole.
5. Vizagapatam.	10. Chingleput.

The Coimbatore Municipal Council subsequently rescinded its resolution.

(*b*) No.

(*c*) The Government were advised that it is not open to a municipal council to prohibit the slaughtering of cows and cattle within municipal limits and that any resolution or a bylaw framed by the council prohibiting it will be ultra vires.

Medical Administration

Enquiry into the trouble among students in the Government School of Indian Medicine.

51 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. RANGASWAMI REDDI: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the hon. Member is aware of the trouble caused among the students of the Government School of Indian Medicine, Madras, on the 17th February 1932;

(*b*) whether the Government have received any memorial from certain advocates of Madras who witnessed the incident;

(*c*) if so, what action the Government have taken; and

(*d*) whether the Government have received any report from the Principal of the School of Indian Medicine?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Government have received a copy of a statement issued to the press by some advocates who held an enquiry into the matter. No advocate witnessed the incident.

(*c*) It was forwarded to the Principal, Indian Medical School.

(*d*) The Principal has made a final report on the matter.

Registration of L.I.M.'s.

52 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether he has made any arrangement for the registration of the Licentiate of Indian Medicine; and

(*b*) if not, why not; and

(*c*) when he expects to be able to decide the question of registering the L.I.M.'s ?

A.—(*a*), (*b*) & (*c*) The Central Board of Indian Medicine, constituted to advise Government on matters relating to Indian Medicine, has formulated proposals for the registration of L.I.M.'s. They are under consideration.

Supervision of L.I.M.'s working in rural dispensaries.

53 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether he is aware of the fact that the L.I.M.'s are working in rural dispensaries;

(*b*) what provision he has made for supervising their work and the dispensaries; and

(*c*) if he has not yet made any, what he intends doing and when ?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) The Government have decided that till the question of constituting a suitable inspecting agency for these institutions is settled, their control and supervision should vest in the local boards concerned.

(*c*) The Principal, Government Indian Medical School, has separately forwarded the proposals of the Central Board of Indian Medicine for the appointment of Inspecting Medical Officers for supervising the work of the medical practitioners in charge of the institutions of Indian Medicine. The proposals are under the consideration of Government.

Opening a Central Store of Indian Medicine.

54 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state, what arrangements he is going to make for opening a Central Store of Indian Medicine ?

A.—Proposals for opening a Central Store of Indian Medicine were deferred pending the constitution of the Central Board of Indian Medicine to advise Government on matters relating to Indian Medicine. The question will now be taken up in consultation with the Central Board which has since been constituted.

[2nd August 1932

Village Panchayats

Travelling allowance of an Honorary Organizer of Village Panchayats.

55 *Q.*—Pandit Ganala Ramamurti: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) what the minimum and maximum amount is that can be drawn as travelling allowance by a Taluk Honorary Organizer of Village Panchayats according to rules, if any;

(*b*) how many times they are expected to tour in the year and whether they are required to maintain diaries regarding the nature of their work in villages; and

(*c*) the number of Honorary Organizers of Village Panchayats in the district of Kistna and the area allotted to each of the said Honorary Organizers of Village Panchayat Boards?

A.—(*a*) There are no fixed minima or maxima. A fixed allowance of Rs. 2 a day is given to honorary organizers for journeys performed beyond a radius of five miles from their headquarters under the specific orders of the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards.

(*b*) No minimum touring has been prescribed. They are required to maintain diaries.

(*c*) The information is furnished below:—

Taluk.	Number of honorary organizers.
Kaikalur	3
Bezwada	1
Tiruvur	1
Gudivada	2
Gannavaram	1

[*Note.*—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

IV.—ACTS ASSENTED TO BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

* The hon. the President:—" I have to announce that the undermentioned Acts received the assent of His Excellency the Governor on the dates mentioned against each:—

(1) The Madras Cotton Control Act—28th April 1932.
(2) The Madras Co-operative Societies Act—9th May 1932."

V.—PANEL OF CHAIRMEN.

* The hon. the President:—" I have to announce to the House that under rule 3 of the Madras Legislative Council Rules, I have nominated the following four Members of the Council to be a Panel of Chairmen for this session of the Council:—

(1) Rao Bahadur A. T. Pannirselvam.
(2) Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar.
(3) Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.
(4) Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan."

VI.—ELECTION OF FIVE MEMBERS TO THE SENATE OF THE ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The Vice-Chancellor of the Annamalai University having requested me that arrangements may be made for the election, according to the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote, of five Members of this Council to the Senate of that University, I have directed that the elections should be held in accordance with the Regulations made under Standing Order No. 80. In accordance with these Regulations, I fix 2 p.m. on the 3rd August 1932 as the latest time by which notice of nominations may be sent to the Secretary.

" If the number of candidates nominated exceeds the number of vacancies to be filled, there will be an election between 12 noon and 3 p.m. on the 4th August 1932."

VII.—HOUSE COMMITTEE.

* The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :— 11-45 a.m.
" I beg to move—

> ' *that, with a view to appoint a House Committee in pursuance of Standing Order No. 84, this Council do proceed to elect six Members to be Members of the said Committee according to the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote* '."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have to inform the House that with reference to Regulation II of the Regulations for the holding of elections by means of the single transferable vote, I fix 3 p.m. to-day as the time by which the nominations of candidates for election to the House Committee should be sent to the Secretary."

VIII.—DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1932-33.

GRANT VI—IRRIGATION (EXCLUDING CAUVERY-METTUR PROJECT)—RESERVED.

* The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL :—" Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move—

> ' *that Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs.* 58,300 *under Grant VI—Irrigation (excluding Cauvery-Mettur Project)—Reserved* '.

" Sir, this grant is required for four works which are indicated on the agenda paper. The first of these is to provide for the realignment of the Godavari flood bank on the Polavaram Island. The flood bank was seriously eroded between miles 3/3 and 4/4 this year. The cheapest way of remedying this is to realign the bank from mile 3, so that it will run alongside the local fund earthen road from Amalapur to Yenam. The work is estimated to cost Rs. 21,000. As it is urgent and should be carried out this year, the Government have authorized the starting of the work. As the expenditure can be met by reappropriation, I ask for a token grant of Rs. 100 only.

[Sir Archibald Campbell] [2nd August 1932

"The next item is to provide for the contribution to be made towards the cost of the Central Board of Irrigation. A Central Bureau of Information on irrigation matters has been established by the Government of India for various purposes such as the dissemination of technical information, contact with other countries through publications so as to be in touch with up-to-date methods of engineering, maintenance of a technical library, liaison between the provinces so that the experience gained in one place may be usefully employed at another place, publicity for the purpose of educating public opinion, co-ordination of research work and publication of general and technical papers. The Government of India have asked the various local Governments to subscribe towards its maintenance, the contribution from the Central Government being limited to Rs. 2,500 per annum. The share of the Madras Government has been fixed at Rs. 7,500 per annum. I have therefore come forward with a token demand for Rs. 100, as the required amount can be found by reappropriation.

"The next item refers to the purchase of two new dredgers for Kistna Central Division. The existing grab dredgers Nos. 7 and 8 were purchased about forty years ago and have worked continuously every season. They are now worn out, repair charges have become very heavy and their working is very uneconomical. Further expenditure on the existing grab dredgers would be waste of money. The replacement of the dredgers has become imperatively necessary. It is estimated that these dredgers will cost about Rs. 85,000, of which we hope to find Rs. 27,000, by reappropriation.

"The fourth item relates to the diversion of Tamparaparni flood banks at the Attur Eral and Settupatti sets. As hon. Members are aware there has been a considerable amount of damage done in recent years by floods in the Tamparaparni. High floods in the Tamparaparni in December 1931 caused a number of breaches in the left flood bank above and below the Srivaikuntam anicut. We hope by diverting the flood bank to obviate the difficulties. The Chief Engineer has submitted an estimate amounting to Rs. 28,100, for protecting the right bank of the river at Attur. He has himself approved of two other smaller estimates amounting to Rs. 18,800 and Rs. 10,500 for forming diversion banks at the Eral and Settupatti sets. I have therefore to move for a token grant of Rs. 100, as the money can be found by reappropriation."

* Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask the hon. the Revenue Member whether the scale of expenditure on the establishment of the Central Bureau of Information as proposed by the Government of India is justifiable? To me it seems that the expenditure is extravagant, because I happened to be a member of the Government of India Sub-Committee that dealt with this question and I know how money is being spent. It should not be understood that I am in any way opposing this grant, more especially as the amount is required for the establishment of a Board of Engineers concerning irrigational problems. But to me it seems that the scale of expenditure is not altogether justifiable.

2nd August 1932] [Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar]

"Then, Sir, with reference to the purchase of two new dredgers for Kistna Central Division, I wish to know whether it is not possible to carry on the work with the existing dredgers only for some more years by repairing them."

* The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"Sir, the maximum total expenditure which is likely to be incurred by the Central Board of Irrigation is about Rs. 47,500. I am afraid I have not got details of the actual items of expenditure. But I will certainly ask the Government of India to give us those details.

"As regards the purchase of new dredgers, the existing dredgers were purchased in 1893 and they have been working ever since. The machinery has become worn out, the main crankshafts were broken in 1930 and have been temporarily patched up; the boiler of one has been condemned and the working pressure of the other has been reduced from 80 lb. to 60 lb.; the repairing charges are very heavy. I will however communicate the suggestions of my hon. Friend Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar to the Chief Engineer and ask him whether the expenditure can be safely reduced by adopting them."

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

GRANT XXI—AGRICULTURE—TRANSFERRED.

* The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—"On the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor I beg to move—

'*that Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs.* 100, *under Demand XXI—Agriculture—Transferred.*'

"Sir, this sum is required for making provision for carrying out experiments in connexion with dry cultivation in the lower Bhavani project. Sir, in connexion with this scheme the Director of Agriculture has proposed to make certain experiments in consultation with the Irrigation department. These experiments are considered to be necessary and they have to be carried out immediately. The duration of these experiments will be about ten months. The items of expenditure are given in the Explanatory Memorandum. After all the expenditure can be met by reappropriation in the present year's budget. I hope the House will grant this demand."

* Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"I beg to move— 12 noon.

'*that the grant be reduced by Re.* 1.'

"At the outset I may remark that I think that this grant should rather come under an Irrigation Demand rather than under an Agricultural Demand. But the object with which I have moved this amendment is to ask the Government the grounds on which they have made up their minds to treat this Lower Bhavani project as a dry crop scheme and not as a wet crop scheme. I should like to know the data on which they have come to this conclusion. The principle on which irrigation schemes are classed as dry crop or wet crop is briefly as follows. A dry crop scheme can only succeed when the total annual rainfall

or the seasonal rainfall is so low as to necessitate the demand for irrigation water. Whereas in the case of areas where the average rainfall is sufficiently great, dry crop schemes are impossible. If you look at the rainfall on the Lower Bhavani area you will find that it varies from 20 to 40 inches. An area where the average rainfall is about 30 inches is, in my opinion, entirely unsuited for dry crop irrigation schemes, because the ryot will get what he wants from the rainfall alone. I should therefore like to know on what grounds the Government have come to the conclusion to treat the Lower Bhavani scheme which was originally designed as a wet crop scheme, as a dry crop scheme. The total area commanded is not more than two or three times the wet irrigation area originally proposed under the Lower Bhavani scheme. Do the Government hope to get a sufficient area of dry crop irrigation to justify the scheme and make it productive? It seems to me that before you go on with experiments on demands of water for various kinds of dry crops and so forth, these fundamental questions will have to be discussed, considered and answered. Have the Government done that?

"I shall now come to the question of these dry crop experiments. I do not know how the proposal originated. We have got, if not in this Presidency, certainly in this country, an enormous amount of literature on this question of dry crop irrigation. It has been in vogue ever since irrigation started in the Punjab and the United Provinces and for years and years irrigation officers in these Provinces have conducted experiments, collected data and published them. Have the Government studied all this? How did they find out the necessity for further experiments? What will they find after experimenting on an area of 16 acres for a period of ten months? Why should they discard the mass of information that is available? Why do they not base their schemes on the enormous data that are available to anyone who is willing to go into them? Do the Government think that they can get any reliable data from their experiments conducted for a period of ten months? I should rather think that the experiments should go on for a period of ten years. Because, to put only one objection, when your experiments are going on you may get rainfall. What inference will you draw as to the total requirements of water for a particular acreage on which you are experimenting? It seems to me, Sir, that the proposal does not fully take into account not merely the mass of information available on the subject but even the elementary requirements of a case like this. Assuming that we have not got any data available on this question, to say that by experiments conducted in a small area over a short period of ten months we will be able to collect data sufficiently satisfactory to base our schemes on is, I think, nothing short of absurdity. Rainfall varies from year to year; in one year we have 20 inches and in another year we have 40 inches. Must you not at least carry on experiments over a period of five or six years so that you may exhaust the varying conditions of rainfall from year to year? I doubt very much whether the scheme now put before the House has been well considered. As I said before, the scheme was worked out as a wet

crop scheme many years ago for very adequate reasons. I fail altogether to see the reasons which have induced the Government to alter their minds, I do not even know if they have altered their decision or whether they are simply going to experiment with dry crop irrigation and then go back to wet crop irrigation. I merely ask for information on all these points. I should like that this question is postponed until we know the elementary facts about this thing. Otherwise, I am afraid they will be conducting experiments which may prove perfectly futile and thoroughly inadequate.

"Again, supposing there were no data available at all, why should not the Government conduct these experiments on their Coimbatore Central Farm itself? They have a big establishment there. There is a channel from the Noyyal river passing through the farm; there are wells provided with pumps. There are all kinds of soils. Why do not the Government select a plot there and ask the Farm Establishment to collect this information? It is the work of the Agricultural Department and if they have not got the information already they will do well to collect it now. I should like my hon. Friend to answer these questions if he can."

* Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"Mr. President, my hon. Friend, the Chief Minister, thinks that these experiments should be conducted also for the Ceded districts. I entirely agree with him. I will say for his information and for the information of his hon. Colleague that, long, long ago, the Agricultural department wanted to find out whether the dry lands in the Ceded districts could be profitably irrigated or not. It was with that object that the Hagari Farm was started. Different experiments were proposed to be conducted there with reference to dry, and possibly wet, crops also. As my hon. Friend, Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, has pointed out, there are lands already in the possession of the Government where the experiments under contemplation by the Government could be conducted. I do not see the need for acquiring or leasing fresh lands when already they have lands of different kinds at their disposal. After all there is no reliability in the results of experiments, conducted over a short period. Some peculiar and unexpected conditions may crop up and make the results unsafe for any definite inference to be drawn from them. I therefore think that the hon. the Minister will be well advised to drop this scheme and see if he cannot carry out systematic experiments on the different soils already in the possession of Government."

* Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—"Sir, the Government have two objects in the experiments they are going to conduct. The first is to find out the water requirements of dry crops and the second is to obtain data with regard to first and second crop ayacuts. So far as the second object is concerned I have the least objection to it. It is very necessary. But I have my own misgivings with regard to the first object. When the Upper Bhavani project was taken up the Government deputed an I.C.S. officer to investigate the water requirements of dry crops. What the Special Officer did we do not know. The people of Coimbatore do not know the gentlemen whom

[Mr. C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar] [2nd August 1932

the Special Officer interviewed in the areas in which he was conducting his investigation. But all of a sudden we heard that the Special Officer had reported that with regard to the Upper Bhavani project dry crop irrigation would be a failure. He seems to have reported that owing to the loss of water due to evaporation and to heavy absorption on account of the porosity of the soil, the scheme will not succeed. I have my own misgivings that with regard to the Lower Bhavani project also the Government might say that the water that can be stored under the Lower Bhavani project will not be sufficient for dry crop irrigation and the project should be abandoned. Therefore I want an assurance from the hon. Minister for Public Works and the hon. Member for Irrigation that at the end of these experiments they will not say that the scheme will be a failure and should therefore be abandoned. I am anxious that the Government should not repeat the history of the Upper Bhavani project in the case of the Lower Bhavani project also."

* Mr. S. H. SLATER:—" Mr. President, Sir, the amendment moved by the hon. Member opposite would have the effect of giving a wider scope to the discussion than was intended by the Government. The hon. Member raised the question whether the Government have considered and made up their minds finally as to whether the Lower Bhavani project should be undertaken as a wet irrigation project or a project for the irrigation of dry crops. He seemed to think that no consideration had been paid to the immense volume of literature on the subject of dry crop irrigation which has been collected in various parts of India. I have no doubt that that literature has been carefully studied, and though I am not departmentally in a position to say whether the Government have finally decided the question or not, I imagine that the experiment now proposed is one of the factors which will be taken
12-15 p.m. into consideration before the final decision is made. But certainly, speaking as one guilty or, at any rate, responsible, to a certain extent for the latest reports from the district on this point, I have personally endeavoured to support the case for taking up the Lower Bhavani scheme as a dry project. In this connexion there was one point mentioned by my hon. Friend Mr. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar to which I must refer. He seemed apprehensive whether in view of the discouraging and frigid report which caused the abandonment of the Upper Bhavani project we are justified in conducting this experiment on the Lower Bhavani, and whether we would not meet with precisely the same difficulties and disappointments. I think it necessary to point out that this is a very much more modest scheme with a much shorter main channel which will obviate a great deal of the loss or wastage of water. The intention is to provide this irrigation as supplementary to the crops which are raised by rainfall at present. The most delicate part of the task of the Engineering department is to arrange for a supply of water so as to coincide with the season in each half of its area when the rainfall is at its lowest. The object of this little experiment, of which my hon. Friend opposite spoke with apparent contempt, is to educate the ryot as to the advantages, in that particular area, of dry crop irrigation as compared with wet crop irrigation.

2nd August 1932] [Mr. S. H. Slater]

"In order to ensure that the cultivators in that area will be ready to accept the scheme and agree to pay the water-rate it is considered desirable by the Director of Agriculture—whose opinion the Government have accepted—that the ryot should be shown by experiments on his own ground—in his own area and not elsewhere—the advantages which will accrue, and the amount of water that will be required actually in practice. The experiments should be conducted in the very area of the project and not elsewhere in other parts of India. We want to make experiments in the very area which is going to be benefited by this project.

"I think—if I may say so—the hon. Member who moved the amendment has deliberately ignored the explanatory note which accompanied the Demand for this Grant. It says:—'At present the ryot, after shallow cultivation, irrigates his land grown with cholam, cumbu or ragi once in five or six days. The issue is whether land with the same crops may be irrigated at longer intervals, say, once in ten days, whether with shallow or deep cultivation.' This is the justification for this minor experiment, which is covered by the demand for this supplementary grant, which the hon. Minister has brought forward. I therefore oppose the amendment. I hope the House will not be tempted to follow the hon. Member in a general excursion into the relative advantages of wet and dry crop irrigation."

* Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—"Sir, I am somewhat in a difficulty to find out as to what exactly the last speaker meant. I asked, Sir, whether the Government have definitely made up their minds. He has not told us whether they have made up their minds or not. My hon. Friend has completely ignored the question of rainfall, the suitability of the project and the total rainfall in that area. I want to know whether the hon. Minister has gathered the necessary information. What I suggested was that you could take advantage of the experience gained in other parts of India as it would be applicable with regard to the Lower Bhavani area. These two main points have not been answered at all. But of course it is not my intention to press my amendment because, after all, I am as much interested as my hon. Friend, the Minister in getting this project through without the least possible delay. It seems to me that these small experiments seem to be devised for delaying the carrying out of the scheme still further."

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

* Mr. K. Koti Reddi:—'Mr. President, Sir, I move—

'*that the Demand of Rs.* 100 *for Agriculture—Transferred, be reduced by Re.* 1.'

"I wish to know from the hon. Minister why similar experiments should not be made in the Ceded districts. My hon. Friend, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, has pointed out that there is great necessity for trying the same experiment in that area. I am glad that the Government has come forward to make these experiments in some area.

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi] [2nd August 1932

"Another point I wish to refer to is if the Government wants to take up the Tungabhadra or Tungabhadra-Kistna project in the Ceded districts, they should conduct experiments to see how far the dry black cotton soil can be utilized for irrigation purposes. The original Tungabhadra project was intended to supply water for dry cultivation, to supply water for cholam and cotton crops. With regard to the question of irrigating the black cotton soil, no experiments have so far been made. If the Tungabhadra-Kistna project has to be successfully worked out, some portions of dry lands may have to be utilized for irrigation purposes."

* The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"Sir, my hon. Friend in charge of Irrigation wanted these experiments to be conducted. If the Government propose to carry out the same experiments in other places, the Department of Agriculture will certainly be very glad to help. The Agricultural Department is only helping the Irrigation Department in finding out what amount of water will be required, say, for an acre. It has been pointed out that the period of 10 months is a very short one. If necessary, it may be extended. We shall then come before this House and ask for further sanction.

"With regard to the remarks of my hon. Friend, Mr. Koti Reddi, the Agricultural Department would be very glad to carry out experiments and give facilities to any portion of the Ceded districts, if new schemes are introduced there."

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

The main demand for Rs. 100 was put and carried and the grant made.

GRANT XXIX—CIVIL WORKS—TRANSFERRED AND RESERVED.

* The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move—

'that the Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs. 100 under Grant XXIX—Civil Works—Transferred and Reserved.'

"This demand is to provide for electric installation in the residences of Government Officers in Guntur. I do not think it is necessary to make out a case for the introduction of electric installation in these buildings. As is stated in the note, the amount required for this purpose can be met by reappropriation. The Government will not be a loser if this work is carried out as the amount will be recovered by way of increased rent for the buildings. I hope the Council would be pleased to pass this motion."

The demand was put and carried and the grant made.

GRANT XXXII—FAMINE RELIEF—RESERVED.

* The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move—

'that the Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs. 2,75,000 under Grant XXXII—Famine Relief—Reserved.'

2nd August 1932] [Sir Archibald Campbell]

" In the present budget estimates which have been sanctioned, the amount allotted under this head is Rs. 25,000. That was made in order to meet expenditure immediately if necessary to combat famine in any area. Unfortunately owing to the failure of crops in a small portion of the Bellary district, namely, in portions of the Bellary taluk and adjacent taluks, it was found necessary by the local officers last December to provide work on certain ordinary works first and afterwards to expand them as a measure of relief. There are some test works under the Famine Code in this area to see whether it is necessary to introduce regular relief works or not. In order that we may be able to meet possible expenditure, I move that the Government be granted a further sum of Rs. 2,75,000."

* Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" Sir, I move— 12-30 p.m.

> ' *that the Demand of Rs.* 2,75,000 *for Famine Relief—Reserved, be reduced by Rs.* 100 '

in order to elicit information about the proposals of the Government and the progress made with reference to the Tungabhadra Project.

" Sir, the first point I would like to ask my hon. Friend about is what exactly are the Government's proposals with reference to famine or scarcity that is supposed to exist at present in the Bellary district? Up to June, I believe, the Government pursued the policy of expanding the local works carried on under the orders of the District Board. This system, as far as I have been able to ascertain from my friends in the Bellary district, has been giving satisfaction; and the wages earned by the workers, although they are not much, seemed on the whole to have given a fair amount of satisfaction. I would like to know why Government have now stopped these local board works and have started test works. The procedure no doubt is in accordance with the Famine Code; and apparently it has been based on the anticipation of the occurrence of what Government technically call ' famine '. I do not however know, Sir, the data on which this decision has been based.

" Before I proceed to make further remarks, I would like to draw the attention of my hon. friend the Revenue Member and of this House to the policy underlying the provisions of the Madras Famine Code. The Madras Famine Code, Sir, was drafted and brought into operation for dealing with cases of widespread famine at a time when communications and the progress and expansion of irrigation works were not what they are at present. Since those old days, communications have expanded, new lines of railway and new roads have been built, new irrigation works have come into existence; and to-day, Sir, except in the Ceded districts, one might well say that we would not have a recurrence of famine again in our province. The Ceded districts really remain to-day a blot on the administration; they have continued to be a blot in spite of incessant public demands, in spite of repeated suffering of the people, and in spite of repeated representations from all sides of this House that all measures

should be taken for combating famine in those districts. Therefore, remove this blot and save the Ceded districts from the possibility of recurring famines.

" I was talking, Sir, about the Famine Code. The system underlying the Famine Code is based on what I may call barbarism. Ideas of helping the unemployed have changed all over the world; and to-day, Sir, I think India with its Famine Code stands unique in presenting to the world a spectacle of doles or famine wages that have no parallel anywhere else in the world.

" Sir, the policy that has been advocated by the numerous Famine Commissions that have sat to consider this question of the avoidance of famine and by the Irrigation Commission in addition, has been the construction of irrigation works drawing their supplies from unfailing sources; and they all thought that was the only satisfactory remedy. Government are aware of it; but to-day, as I have said, we remain where we were a hundred and fifty years ago. The question of the construction of a large irrigation work that would carry the fertilizing waters of the Tungabhadra river through these districts which are known to be subjected to repeated famines, has been considered by Commission after Commission. We have had investigation after investigation made, all with the same result,—that the estimates have been shelved for the time being. Last of all, we had an investigation recently, and now we are again told what we all know already—that this question is under correspondence with the Government of His Exalted Highness, the Mysore Government and so on and so forth. But what we would like to know, Sir, is whether Government cannot make up their mind once for all to get through with this scheme, to take such measures as may be necessary to arrive at an expeditious decision—a decision which can only be arrived at by the personal initiative and energy of the highest officers of Government who have to deal with this question.

" Sir, I hope my friend, the hon. the Revenue Member, will be able to give us a satisfactory answer to this question as to when they would arrive at a decision concerning the Tungabhadra project. Will he take it up as a personal matter and push through the scheme? For, if he does it, he will earn the everlasting gratitude of the many thousands inhabiting these districts, who have been time and again suffering unspeakable horrors from repeated famines. It is, Sir, a task which might fire the enthusiasm and energy of any man entrusted with it—a task of great magnitude and beneficence. I hope, Sir, my hon. Friend will rise to the occasion.

" Concerning the test works started, I was saying that the Famine Code as it stands to-day is a relic of the barbarous ideas that obtained thirty or forty years ago. One has only to look at the provisions of the Famine Code to find out the way in which the wages are arrived at, and also to realize how cruel and totally out of date these provisions are. In fact, I consider it necessary that the Government should alter the policy underlying the Famine Code altogether. My friend would no doubt tell me that that is a matter for the Government of India to decide; but

2nd August 1932] [Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar]

surely this Government has a voice, and must have a powerful voice in deciding the policy in a matter of this kind. I would beg leave of the House, Sir, to read a sentence from the Introduction to the Famine Code:

'. . . Though the State is bound to protect the people from starvation in times of distress, it is no part of its duty to maintain them at their normal level of comfort or to insure them against all suffering, and that its interference should impair as little as possible the traditional and family obligations of the social system of the country, such, for instance, as those involved in the relationship of the members of a family, of landholder and farm-labourer, of master and servant, of alms-giver and alms-receiver.'

"Sir, I hope the Government will consider that this policy is entirely out of date. It certainly does not satisfy civilized opinion. It would not satisfy civilized opinion in any country of the world, and we ought therefore to protest against this policy here. In other countries where there is suffering and starvation, where there is unemployment, the Government comes to the relief of the people in the shape of free doles; but here, Sir, tasks are set to these poor suffering people, those tasks are enforced, and the wages are calculated on what Government call ' minimum rations '—just enough to keep body and soul together, to prevent death from starvation. That, Sir, they say is the policy of the Government, and that is the policy underlying the Famine Code—just to prevent people dying and nothing more. They can starve, they can deteriorate—and the Famine Code is blind and deaf to all that. They just give these people enough food to prevent them from death. Sir, I must protest against this policy, and in view of the situation in the Bellary district, in view of the dissatisfaction which these test works that have been started have created, and in view of the fact that there are many more useful ways of spending public money on public works of utility, I hope that the Government will see their way to continue the policy they were adopting hitherto, of providing relief to the unemployed by the construction and the continuation of ordinary public works of utility."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The amendment is that the Demand of Rs. 2,75,000 be reduced by Rs. 100.

"Mr. Koti Reddi's amendment is covered by this amendment, and therefore he may speak on this amendment."

* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"Mr. President, Sir, I have given notice of a similar amendment with a view to raise the same question, viz., whether the Government, instead of giving relief by taking up ordinary road works, will not be well-advised in spending the money on the proposed Tungabhadra project. It may be, Sir, that the Government may not come to a decision on this project for some years or even for a century; but everybody must admit that there must come a time when it will be taken up. At present the project is ready. The areas through which the big canals have to run are well-known and defined, and there is nothing more to trouble the Government, if they only make up their mind to spend money on those works which are immediately necessary for taking

up the Tungabhadra project. It may be, as I said, that Government may not be able to decide at once to take up the project; but seeing the necessity for a project of this magnitude, seeing the insistent demand for such a project in the Ceded Districts, seeing that it would save millions of people in those parts from famine, seeing also that there is a great amount of water available which is at present running to waste, Government may very well consider the advisability of spending this amount on the project. Seeing that all these conditions necessary for a big project are there, cannot the Government make up its mind, in the hope that this project will be taken up one day or the other, to spend money on the construction of the proposed big canals, etc., in the Tungabhadra project, instead of spending money on road works which are ill-maintained? We
12-45 p.m. cannot say whether the district boards are maintaining or can maintain the roads in good condition. So, Sir, Government will see its way to spend its money for the purpose of digging main canals, subsidiary canals, etc., in the Tungabhadra project. As my hon. Friend, Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar said, I appeal to the hon. the Revenue Member within the short time that may be available for this Government under the present system, to take up the project in right earnest, if necessary, with the concurrence of the Nizam's Government and the Mysore Government, and complete it within a reasonable period. The Ceded Districts Committee, I believe, recommended the Malappuram site for the reservoir. I once again appeal to the hon. the Revenue Member to take up this project on hand, and whether he comes to any conclusion about the desirability of the project being taken up in the near future or not, the money would be better spent if it is spent on digging canals under the Tungabhadra project immediately."

* Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"Mr. President, Sir, the Government have been less than fair to the people affected by distress in the Bellary district. You will find from the Press Communiqué issued on 29th June 1932 that the Government were fully aware of the acute conditions prevailing in certain areas of that district. In order to afford some relief to the people affected, they started in December last several works and they gave the management thereof to the district boards. In doing so, they did not initiate any new policy, but they simply carried out the policy once pursued in 1927 and, I venture to say, successfully pursued. That went on up to April when conditions became worse and the Collector and the local authorities asked that more works should be started and the Government accordingly sanctioned additional works. But after a month or so, I believe, the Finance Department thought that, if the money which was being spent on these works was to be debited to the famine grant, the works should be carried on under the provisions of the Famine Code. One would expect, when such an objection was taken by the Finance Department, all that the Government should have done was to start famine relief works, because they were convinced of the distress, they had been carrying on the work for nearly four or five months and the works had been attracting a large number of people. If the Government had felt that they were technically wrong,

2nd August 1932] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

all that they should have done was to start relief works under the provisions of the Famine Code. But, instead of doing that, they wanted to start things right from the beginning by starting some test works to satisfy themselves whether there was distress in the area or not. You will see, Sir, from the figures furnished in the answers given to-day, that these works, with a higher standard of outturn, with less of wages and more of disabilities, still attracted a considerable large number of people. I find the works attracted as many as about 18,000 or 19,000 people; the number fell down, it again rose, but at any rate the figure remains somewhere about 13,000. (The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell: 12,000.) I stand corrected. How long is this test work to go on? You may ask me what is your objection to it? The work may be called by any name, but so long as works are in progress, people get some work to do though at some low wages. There is this difference between conditions which obtain under the test work system and the conditions which obtain under the famine relief system. I will enumerate them one by one. When the works are called test works, the coolies are asked to do somewhat more than they would be asked to do if the works are called relief works. This is number one. Under this system, they do not work on all the seven days of the week but they have what is called a rest day every week and on that day they do not work and get no wages at all. Whereas, if the works are called famine relief works, they will be paid wages for all the days in the week, including the rest day. Again, Sir, when the works are called test works, the dependents of the coolies who are actually working, do not get any relief at all; whereas, if it is relief work, the dependents of coolies who are actually working are fed in the kitchen. There is also gratuitous relief given to the disabled and the destitute.

"Now, Sir, the absence of facilities that would accrue to them if the works are relief works, is a very serious handicap to the people affected and I think the attitude of the Government in this matter is quite unjustifiable from my point of view. If they wanted to satisfy themselves of the need for relief works they have had more than ample time for it. Normally, 15 days is a reasonable time within which they may satisfy themselves whether the period of test should end and relief works should be taken on hand or not. In 1921, this very question was gone into and the then Member for Anantapur, Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai, and myself tabled a resolution and carried it in this House, to the effect that a committee should go into this matter thoroughly. Accordingly a committee was appointed and one of the things they had to enquire into was this, namely, the stringency of the test work conditions. The hardships complained of were: (1) that no allowances are given to dependents; (2) that no deductions are made for distances travelled; (3) that the interval between the test stage and the declaration of famine is long; (4) that the tasks enforced are high; and (5) that rest-day allowances are not given. That Committee went into these questions in detail and they came to some definite conclusions in regard to all of them. For example, as regards the last point they held that, 'there need be no rest-day nor any allowances therefor, but the workers should be permitted

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [2nd August 1932

to work on all days in the week '. They said that the distance should be calculated in assessing the outturn of work and they were emphatically of the opinion that the interval between the test stage and the declaration of famine should be the minimum possible. If, after 15 days, it was found that the test works done did not draw enough number of people, well, they might close the works and treat them as ordinary works. They went on to say that if the test works attracted a large number of people, then the works should be converted into relief works. I am quite aware of the fact that there is no categorical mention of the period within which a test work should be converted into a relief work. But, anybody who goes through the whole report, through the terms of the subsequent reference to the Committee, the order passed on that report and the report of the Committee and the modifications effected in the Famine Code, cannot but come to the conclusion that it was never contemplated that the test period should be prolonged to as long as two months, as it has been done in the present stage. In fact, you find in the Committee's report: ' We wish further to emphasize the fact that there should be no avoidable delay in converting test works into relief works '. That was the report of the Committee. At that time, there was an impression on the part of certain Government officials that the test works should continue as long as two months at least. About this, the Committee's view was—and the Government also agreed with the Committee—' in the tracts visited, we have noticed a mistaken impression on the part of some officials that the period of two months above referred to applies not only to the distribution of gratuitous relief, but also to the continuous attendance of a large number of workers. To avoid undesirable results of this misconception, we suggest the insertion of an explanatory note at the foot of the section '. In regard to the declaration of relief works, they gave power to the Board to say that the test works should be converted into relief works. They further stated, ' to go further, i.e., to seek in addition Government's approval for the conversion of the test works into relief work is in our opinion to court delay in a matter which brooks none and possibly to impose needless suffering at a stage when it has to be avoided most '. That is the remark of the Committee in this matter and the Government also agreed with them and modified the section in the Famine Code accordingly. Now, when all that has been done, it seems rather strange that the Government should be hesitating over this matter.

" The other day, the hon. the Revenue Member went over this area, and I dare say he has visited some of the places and seen many of the conditions under which these people work. He might probably have seen one or two coolies in a gang not working for full time. Probably, they had gone after the day's work of eight hours or after finishing their work early, or they might have gone to pick up some fuel for cooking. But, to base upon that general conclusion and to say that the people are not in need of any relief, I think, would be dangerous. The Famine Code does not give them anything for procuring fuel. I do not think the hon. the Revenue Member went into all the details of the matter or tried to find out the special circumstances under which the particular gang which he saw closed their work early and went away. Whatever it

2nd August 1932] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

may be, the very fact that as many as 12,000 people are working here day after day for a small wage shows conclusively that real distress exists there and there can be no reason whatsoever for delaying the conversion of these test works into relief works.

" In the Press Communiqué of the 29th June 1932, Government say that they have not seen signs of emaciation on the part of these people and so they would wait for some time more before they convert these test works into relief works. I think this is a dangerous position on the part of the Government to take, and it would be dangerous to wait for four or five months. I would also like to remind the hon. the Revenue Member that the Government should not think that the present famine policy is really to wait for emaciation and then give relief. Order on the report of the Committee is clear and the Government's principal business in famine relief has now come to be rather one of dealing with the unemployed and not of dealing with the absence or scarcity of food supplies. That was the position taken up by Government in 1923. I presume the Government have not changed their attitude since. Sir, in other countries, in England for example, unemployed are given cash doles, without any work being exacted. There the unemployed get about 15 sh. a week without doing anything to earn it. Here, we do not give the people anything without getting work from them in return for the money paid. All that is asked for is, give the people some work to do and then pay them, not what they would be getting in normal times, but just enough to enable them to make both ends meet. The wage that is given to these people is merely a subsistence wage and is not even sufficient for the actual needs of the worker concerned. It is not enough to feed the dependents of the people or the disabled persons dependent on them. I would only appeal to the Government to give up their indifferent, unsympathetic attitude in this matter and lose no time in ending this test work and beginning regular relief works." 1 p.m.

* Mr. G. Lakshmana Reddi :—" Mr. President, Sir, I wish to speak a few words on this motion, and in doing so I should like to bring to the notice of the Government that the Ceded districts are hard hit in the matter of irrigation facilities. I think we ought to have got the Tungabhadra Scheme long before the Mettur Project. (Laughter.) Because, Sir, our parts have entirely to depend on rainfall for cultivation, and it is a well-known fact that we do not get sufficient rainfall in our parts. Of course, there are some tanks; they came into existence in the old, old days; but most of them have become silted up and our kind Government have not taken any steps to remove the accumulated silt, so much so these tanks are now of no use for cultivating crops.

" Then, Sir, some of our rivers are dammed up; the Pennar, the Hagari, the Jayamangali and the Chitravati are dammed up by the Mysore Government contrary to the agreement between the British Government and the Mysore Government. We have approached the British Government to see that that agreement is given effect to, but till now nothing has been done.

" Then, Sir, the Tungabhadra Project is hanging in the air and it is not known when it will become an accomplished fact. As such, I

[Mr. G. Lakshmana Reddi] [2nd August 1932

request Government to realize that it is high time that something should be done by way of irrigation facilities to the ryots of the Ceded districts.

"With these words I support the motion."

* The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"Mr. President, Sir, some hon. Members on the other side of the House have referred to irrigation projects to benefit the Ceded districts and more especially to the Tungabhadra Project. They were anxious that that scheme should be pushed through, and they said that they would like to know how that scheme stands. I have on several previous occasions explained that we are carrying on negotiations with the Hyderabad Government and also with the Bombay Government and the Mysore Government, which are also affected by the scheme as the waters of the Tungabhadra pass through their territories or along their borders. I can assure hon. Members that I have been taking a personal interest in furthering this project. (Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: 'Hear hear.') Some time ago when I was acting as Irrigation Member I laid a suggestion to the Chief Engineer that we should endeavour to find another site for the main reservoir which would avoid submerging a portion of the Hyderabad territory either by making the dam higher up the river or by storing water in a reservoir not on the river itself, as in the case of the Sangam Project on the Pennar. These proposals were investigated and an alternative site for a dam on the river was selected. The erection of this dam will however lead to the submergence of a portion of Mysore State and Bombay presidency and we shall have to negotiate with them instead of the Hyderabad Government if that site is finally adopted. It appeared however possible that a joint scheme could be devised in the execution of which the Hyderabad Government might co-operate with us. I went to Hyderabad and placed this proposal before that Government and I am glad to say that they expressed their readiness to investigate this proposal and suggested that we should have a general investigation. Since then, the Hyderabad Government have, I believe, been investigating the possibility of utilizing Tungabhadra water on their side of the river, and I hope before long they will be in a position to forward their proposals, and then we can have a joint investigation of the scheme, as a result of which I hope that something may be done which will benefit the country on both sides of the river. That is the present position of the scheme. I can only now repeat, what I have already said, that I am most anxious to see this project pushed forward. I do realize the vital importance of the scheme to the people of the Ceded districts in the area affected by the project; and it is my desire that we should be able to start the Tungabhadara Project as soon as the Mettur Project is completed, so that we can utilize on the former much of the machinery that is being now used on the latter. That has been my aim all along and I can assure hon. Members that the scheme is being pushed forward as speedily as possible.

"As regards the damming up of the Pennar and the Hagari, the Local Government are carrying on correspondence with the Mysore

2nd August 1932] [Sir Archibald Campbell]

Government in that matter and endeavouring to set matters right in accordance with the Agreement which was signed many years ago by the Mysore and Madras Governments.

" As regards the Famine Code, to which Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar and Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar referred as being somewhat out of date and founded on conditions which no longer exist, I would remind them that though the Famine Code was started when conditions were very different from the present, it has been modified from time to time and has been considerably revised in comparatively recent years. We have taken into consideration the fact that communications have very much improved of late, thereby affecting the supply of grains and foodstuffs to all parts of the Presidency; we no longer depend for indications of famine upon local prices, because they are generally determined now more by outside conditions than by those subsisting in the particular areas concerned. I can remember days when we had to report periodically, I think once a month or once a week, whether famine price level had been reached. Those days are now gone, as that is no longer regarded as an adequate test. The object of the Famine Code is to prevent the waste of Government money in giving relief where it is really not necessary. It is the practice here for agricultural workers to receive such wages during the agricultural season as would enable them to tide over the slack season. The landowners and the ryots have to pay wages accordingly. I am quite sure if we started a work in the middle of the Kistna Delta in March or April we should get a certain number of people to come to it. Test works, admittedly, do not give such good conditions as full relief work, which are started only when it has been decided that it is necessary for the Government to do everything in its power to save people from starvation.

" Now, as regards the conditions existing in the Bellary district I recently paid a visit there. Various works are being carried out. These are road works and are useful; they will be handed over to local boards which will, I hope, complete and maintain them. These works are being carried out as test works under the Famine Code. As I have already observed the rates are raised 25 per cent over the rates provided in the Famine Code, because the price of condiments has not fallen to the same extent as that of the staple food, cholam. I went round some of the works. There are nominally seven test works; in fact, there are really 13 works, some of the works being clubbed together, though separated by some miles. I also visited certain villages and a market on market-day and made all sorts of inquiries. The works have only been recently organized as test works. The test works are cheaper now than when they were in the hands of the local board, as the board was paying higher rates of wages. During the last month the work of organization has been going on, but this cannot be done very easily and it is only now that the organization is becoming satisfactory. Auditors have only been recently appointed by the Accountant-General. It requires a certain amount of time to organize the works and administration so as to ensure that Government money is spent economically and that wages are fully paid to the coolies.

[Sir Archibald Campbell] [2nd August 1932

"Well, Sir, I found the condition of the people everywhere to be, what I would call, normal. There is no reason to think that they are unduly suffering. I do not say that if we had not taken these measures the people would not be in a worse condition than they are now. But I cannot say that I am satisfied that it is necessary that we should convert these works into relief works.

"As regards the particular works to which my hon. Friend referred, I found the labourers leaving the works early, about 2-30 or 3 o'clock. I inquired of them why they were going away so early and they replied that they were going for their meals and would come back; on inquiry, however I learnt they never did return after going off for their meals in the afternoon. I heard complaints on that work that the labourers were earning only one anna six pies instead of two annas one pie, and on inquiry I found the real cause to be what I have just narrated. There is no necessity for them to go away early and they could earn more if they stopped the whole day at the work."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Is it a daily-wage system, or a piece-wage system?"

* The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"A combination of both. If they had done their task they get a full wage, and if they go away before doing the full task, they are paid less according to the amount of work done.

"Another work I found on the same road some three or four miles off. There too I found workmen going away at 3-30. In consequence, I must say I had some doubt whether it is necessary to keep that test work any longer, but as I was told that there was only a little more earth work to be done—there are only two gaps to be filled—and that it will take a fortnight or so to finish the work, I told the Collector that it is not necessary to close it at once, but the earthwork might be completed first."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know whether there is no limit to their hours of work? Are they to work all the 12 hours?"

1-15 p.m. * The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"In most of the works they come about 8 o'clock or later and leave at about 4-30 or 5, I believe. On one work I visited there was nobody on the work at all in the afternoon. I was not going to mention that case as in that particular case there had been a very heavy shower of rain which would have rendered work very difficult. As regards the other works, I found the gangs were generally earning the full wage allowed by the Code. At the same time the condition of the people either on the works or in the villages was not such as to indicate the necessity for the immediate conversion of the test works into relief works. As I mentioned, the gangs are divided into three classes with different wages and work and the gangs are formed according to the work to be done. Recently we had a census report on wages. This census was held once in five years. In last year's report I find in the Bellary district the wages paid in cash to men who were sowers and transplanters were As. 2-11 in black-soil tracts and

2nd August 1932] [Sir Archibald Campbell]

As. 3 in red soil tracts and As. 3-8 in the Tungabhadra channel area. The area affected is mainly black cotton soil and that is why there is not much cultivation going on there now. If the labourers are paid in grain their wage is As. 2-1 in both black and red soil tracts. Women's wages are As. 2-2 and As. 2-1 in cash and As. 1-2 and As. 1-8 in grain. For reaping and harvesting, the cash wages are a little higher, being for men As. 3-2 in black soil and As. 3-5 in red soils. The cash wages for women are As. 2-5 in both soils. I am quoting these to show that the wages now paid on the test works are not very low. During the period of test we are justified in presuming that the people have some resources left; it is not desirable for the Government to take the place of the landlord or the ryot and relieve him of the duty of paying adequate wages by maintaining the labouring classes during the off-season. It is the custom of the country for the agricultural labourers to be paid such wages during the working season as will enable them to tide over the slack season. I can assure the House that we are watching the situation very carefully. The area is not far from the headquarters of the Bellary district and the Collector has easy access to the various works. The Government have displayed considerable sympathy towards this district in the last few years. The communiqué to which my hon. Friend referred will show that we have recently remitted 4½ lakhs of rupees of land revenue and suspended till next year the collection of 2½ lakhs of rupees. We have also been very generous in the matter of loans. I am asking for this grant to enable us to provide, till the next meeting of the Legislative Council, work for the labouring classes in the Bellary district on the present lines; if rains come we may be able to close the works. We have to bear in mind that we must neither make the labouring classes suffer nor waste Government money."

The motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

The demand was put and carried and the grant made.

IX.—THE ORISSA COMMITTEE REPORT.

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move—

'*that the Report of the Orissa Committee be taken into consideration.*' "

Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—" I rise to a point of order. It is said that the motion is made under rule 24-A. That rule I fear does not apply here. No reference has been made by the Government of India under section 52-A. This Council is not competent to consider the question. It is a central subject and this Council has nothing to do with it and it does not appear from the communications received that the Government of India has made any reference to the opinion of this Council."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" Will the hon. Member point out whether the reference of the Government of India is necessary for a motion like this?"

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi] [2nd August 1932

"Another point I wish to refer to is if the Government wants to take up the Tungabhadra or Tungabhadra-Kistna project in the Ceded districts, they should conduct experiments to see how far the dry black cotton soil can be utilized for irrigation purposes. The original Tungabhadra project was intended to supply water for dry cultivation, to supply water for cholam and cotton crops. With regard to the question of irrigating the black cotton soil, no experiments have so far been made. If the Tungabhadra-Kistna project has to be successfully worked out, some portions of dry lands may have to be utilized for irrigation purposes."

* The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"Sir, my hon. Friend in charge of Irrigation wanted these experiments to be conducted. If the Government propose to carry out the same experiments in other places, the Department of Agriculture will certainly be very glad to help. The Agricultural Department is only helping the Irrigation Department in finding out what amount of water will be required, say, for an acre. It has been pointed out that the period of 10 months is a very short one. If necessary, it may be extended. We shall then come before this House and ask for further sanction.

"With regard to the remarks of my hon. Friend, Mr. Koti Reddi, the Agricultural Department would be very glad to carry out experiments and give facilities to any portion of the Ceded districts, if new schemes are introduced there."

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

The main demand for Rs. 100 was put and carried and the grant made.

GRANT XXIX—CIVIL WORKS—TRANSFERRED AND RESERVED.

* The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move—

> '*that the Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs. 100 under Grant XXIX—Civil Works—Transferred and Reserved.*'

"This demand is to provide for electric installation in the residences of Government Officers in Guntur. I do not think it is necessary to make out a case for the introduction of electric installation in these buildings. As is stated in the note, the amount required for this purpose can be met by reappropriation. The Government will not be a loser if this work is carried out as the amount will be recovered by way of increased rent for the buildings. I hope the Council would be pleased to pass this motion."

The demand was put and carried and the grant made.

GRANT XXXII—FAMINE RELIEF—RESERVED.

* The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move—

> '*that the Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs. 2,75,000 under Grant XXXII—Famine Relief—Reserved.*'

2nd August 1932] [Sir Archibald Campbell]

"In the present budget estimates which have been sanctioned, the amount allotted under this head is Rs. 25,000. That was made in order to meet expenditure immediately if necessary to combat famine in any area. Unfortunately owing to the failure of crops in a small portion of the Bellary district, namely, in portions of the Bellary taluk and adjacent taluks, it was found necessary by the local officers last December to provide work on certain ordinary works first and afterwards to expand them as a measure of relief. There are some test works under the Famine Code in this area to see whether it is necessary to introduce regular relief works or not. In order that we may be able to meet possible expenditure, I move that the Government be granted a further sum of Rs. 2,75,000."

* Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, I move— 12-30 p.m.

'*that the Demand of Rs.* 2,75,000 *for Famine Relief—Reserved, be reduced by Rs.* 100'

in order to elicit information about the proposals of the Government and the progress made with reference to the Tungabhadra Project.

"Sir, the first point I would like to ask my hon. Friend about is what exactly are the Government's proposals with reference to famine or scarcity that is supposed to exist at present in the Bellary district? Up to June, I believe, the Government pursued the policy of expanding the local works carried on under the orders of the District Board. This system, as far as I have been able to ascertain from my friends in the Bellary district, has been giving satisfaction; and the wages earned by the workers, although they are not much, seemed on the whole to have given a fair amount of satisfaction. I would like to know why Government have now stopped these local board works and have started test works. The procedure no doubt is in accordance with the Famine Code; and apparently it has been based on the anticipation of the occurrence of what Government technically call 'famine'. I do not however know, Sir, the data on which this decision has been based.

"Before I proceed to make further remarks, I would like to draw the attention of my hon. friend the Revenue Member and of this House to the policy underlying the provisions of the Madras Famine Code. The Madras Famine Code, Sir, was drafted and brought into operation for dealing with cases of widespread famine at a time when communications and the progress and expansion of irrigation works were not what they are at present. Since those old days, communications have expanded, new lines of railway and new roads have been built, new irrigation works have come into existence; and to-day, Sir, except in the Ceded districts, one might well say that we would not have a recurrence of famine again in our province. The Ceded districts really remain to-day a blot on the administration; they have continued to be a blot in spite of incessant public demands, in spite of repeated suffering of the people, and in spite of repeated representations from all sides of this House that all measures

[Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar] [2nd August 1932

should be taken for combating famine in those districts. Therefore, remove this blot and save the Ceded districts from the possibility of recurring famines.

"I was talking, Sir, about the Famine Code. The system underlying the Famine Code is based on what I may call barbarism. Ideas of helping the unemployed have changed all over the world; and to-day, Sir, I think India with its Famine Code stands unique in presenting to the world a spectacle of doles or famine wages that have no parallel anywhere else in the world.

"Sir, the policy that has been advocated by the numerous Famine Commissions that have sat to consider this question of the avoidance of famine and by the Irrigation Commission in addition, has been the construction of irrigation works drawing their supplies from unfailing sources; and they all thought that was the only satisfactory remedy. Government are aware of it; but to-day, as I have said, we remain where we were a hundred and fifty years ago. The question of the construction of a large irrigation work that would carry the fertilizing waters of the Tungabhadra river through these districts which are known to be subjected to repeated famines, has been considered by Commission after Commission. We have had investigation after investigation made, all with the same result,—that the estimates have been shelved for the time being. Last of all, we had an investigation recently, and now we are again told what we all know already—that this question is under correspondence with the Government of His Exalted Highness, the Mysore Government and so on and so forth. But what we would like to know, Sir, is whether Government cannot make up their mind once for all to get through with this scheme, to take such measures as may be necessary to arrive at an expeditious decision—a decision which can only be arrived at by the personal initiative and energy of the highest officers of Government who have to deal with this question.

"Sir, I hope my friend, the hon. the Revenue Member, will be able to give us a satisfactory answer to this question as to when they would arrive at a decision concerning the Tungabhadra project. Will he take it up as a personal matter and push through the scheme? For, if he does it, he will earn the everlasting gratitude of the many thousands inhabiting these districts, who have been time and again suffering unspeakable horrors from repeated famines. It is, Sir, a task which might fire the enthusiasm and energy of any man entrusted with it—a task of great magnitude and beneficence. I hope, Sir, my hon. Friend will rise to the occasion.

"Concerning the test works started, I was saying that the Famine Code as it stands to-day is a relic of the barbarous ideas that obtained thirty or forty years ago. One has only to look at the provisions of the Famine Code to find out the way in which the wages are arrived at, and also to realize how cruel and totally out of date these provisions are. In fact, I consider it necessary that the Government should alter the policy underlying the Famine Code altogether. My friend would no doubt tell me that that is a matter for the Government of India to decide; but

2nd August 1932] [Mr. R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar]

surely this Government has a voice, and must have a powerful voice in deciding the policy in a matter of this kind. I would beg leave of the House, Sir, to read a sentence from the Introduction to the Famine Code:

'. . . Though the State is bound to protect the people from starvation in times of distress, it is no part of its duty to maintain them at their normal level of comfort or to insure them against all suffering, and that its interference should impair as little as possible the traditional and family obligations of the social system of the country, such, for instance, as those involved in the relationship of the members of a family, of landholder and farm-labourer, of master and servant, of alms-giver and alms-receiver.'

"Sir, I hope the Government will consider that this policy is entirely out of date. It certainly does not satisfy civilized opinion. It would not satisfy civilized opinion in any country of the world, and we ought therefore to protest against this policy here. In other countries where there is suffering and starvation, where there is unemployment, the Government comes to the relief of the people in the shape of free doles; but here, Sir, tasks are set to these poor suffering people, those tasks are enforced, and the wages are calculated on what Government call 'minimum rations'—just enough to keep body and soul together, to prevent death from starvation. That, Sir, they say is the policy of the Government, and that is the policy underlying the Famine Code—just to prevent people dying and nothing more. They can starve, they can deteriorate—and the Famine Code is blind and deaf to all that. They just give these people enough food to prevent them from death. Sir, I must protest against this policy, and in view of the situation in the Bellary district, in view of the dissatisfaction which these test works that have been started have created, and in view of the fact that there are many more useful ways of spending public money on public works of utility, I hope that the Government will see their way to continue the policy they were adopting hitherto, of providing relief to the unemployed by the construction and the continuation of ordinary public works of utility."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The amendment is that the Demand of Rs. 2,75,000 be reduced by Rs. 100.

"Mr. Koti Reddi's amendment is covered by this amendment, and therefore he may speak on this amendment."

* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"Mr. President, Sir, I have given notice of a similar amendment with a view to raise the same question, viz., whether the Government, instead of giving relief by taking up ordinary road works, will not be well-advised in spending the money on the proposed Tungabhadra project. It may be, Sir, that the Government may not come to a decision on this project for some years or even for a century; but everybody must admit that there must come a time when it will be taken up. At present the project is ready. The areas through which the big canals have to run are well-known and defined, and there is nothing more to trouble the Government, if they only make up their mind to spend money on those works which are immediately necessary for taking

up the Tungabhadra project. It may be, as I said, that Government may not be able to decide at once to take up the project; but seeing the necessity for a project of this magnitude, seeing the insistent demand for such a project in the Ceded Districts, seeing that it would save millions of people in those parts from famine, seeing also that there is a great amount of water available which is at present running to waste, Government may very well consider the advisability of spending this amount on the project. Seeing that all these conditions necessary for a big project are there, cannot the Government make up its mind, in the hope that this project will be taken up one day or the other, to spend money on the construction of the proposed big canals, etc., in the Tungabhadra project, instead of spending money on road works which are ill-maintained? We
12-45 p.m. cannot say whether the district boards are maintaining or can maintain the roads in good condition. So, Sir, Government will see its way to spend its money for the purpose of digging main canals, subsidiary canals, etc., in the Tungabhadra project. As my hon. Friend, Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar said, I appeal to the hon. the Revenue Member within the short time that may be available for this Government under the present system, to take up the project in right earnest, if necessary, with the concurrence of the Nizam's Government and the Mysore Government, and complete it within a reasonable period. The Ceded Districts Committee, I believe, recommended the Malappuram site for the reservoir. I once again appeal to the hon. the Revenue Member to take up this project on hand, and whether he comes to any conclusion about the desirability of the project being taken up in the near future or not, the money would be better spent if it is spent on digging canals under the Tungabhadra project immediately."

* Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—" Mr. President, Sir, the Government have been less than fair to the people affected by distress in the Bellary district. You will find from the Press Communiqué issued on 29th June 1932 that the Government were fully aware of the acute conditions prevailing in certain areas of that district. In order to afford some relief to the people affected, they started in December last several works and they gave the management thereof to the district boards. In doing so, they did not initiate any new policy, but they simply carried out the policy once pursued in 1927 and, I venture to say, successfully pursued. That went on up to April when conditions became worse and the Collector and the local authorities asked that more works should be started and the Government accordingly sanctioned additional works. But after a month or so, I believe, the Finance Department thought that, if the money which was being spent on these works was to be debited to the famine grant, the works should be carried on under the provisions of the Famine Code. One would expect, when such an objection was taken by the Finance Department, all that the Government should have done was to start famine relief works, because they were convinced of the distress, they had been carrying on the work for nearly four or five months and the works had been attracting a large number of people. If the Government had felt that they were technically wrong,

2nd August 1932] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

all that they should have done was to start relief works under the provisions of the Famine Code. But, instead of doing that, they wanted to start things right from the beginning by starting some test works to satisfy themselves whether there was distress in the area or not. You will see, Sir, from the figures furnished in the answers given to-day, that these works, with a higher standard of outturn, with less of wages and more of disabilities, still attracted a considerable large number of people. I find the works attracted as many as about 18,000 or 19,000 people; the number fell down, it again rose, but at any rate the figure remains somewhere about 13,000. (The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell: 12,000.) I stand corrected. How long is this test work to go on? You may ask me what is your objection to it? The work may be called by any name, but so long as works are in progress, people get some work to do though at some low wages. There is this difference between conditions which obtain under the test work system and the conditions which obtain under the famine relief system. I will enumerate them one by one. When the works are called test works, the coolies are asked to do somewhat more than they would be asked to do if the works are called relief works. This is number one. Under this system, they do not work on all the seven days of the week but they have what is called a rest day every week and on that day they do not work and get no wages at all. Whereas, if the works are called famine relief works, they will be paid wages for all the days in the week, including the rest day. Again, Sir, when the works are called test works, the dependents of the coolies who are actually working, do not get any relief at all; whereas, if it is relief work, the dependents of coolies who are actually working are fed in the kitchen. There is also gratuitous relief given to the disabled and the destitute.

"Now, Sir, the absence of facilities that would accrue to them if the works are relief works, is a very serious handicap to the people affected and I think the attitude of the Government in this matter is quite unjustifiable from my point of view. If they wanted to satisfy themselves of the need for relief works they have had more than ample time for it. Normally, 15 days is a reasonable time within which they may satisfy themselves whether the period of test should end and relief works should be taken on hand or not. In 1921, this very question was gone into and the then Member for Anantapur, Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai, and myself tabled a resolution and carried it in this House, to the effect that a committee should go into this matter thoroughly. Accordingly a committee was appointed and one of the things they had to enquire into was this, namely, the stringency of the test work conditions. The hardships complained of were: (1) that no allowances are given to dependents; (2) that no deductions are made for distances travelled; (3) that the interval between the test stage and the declaration of famine is long; (4) that the tasks enforced are high; and (5) that rest-day allowances are not given. That Committee went into these questions in detail and they came to some definite conclusions in regard to all of them. For example, as regards the last point they held that, 'there need be no rest-day nor any allowances therefor, but the workers should be permitted

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [2nd August 1932

to work on all days in the week '. They said that the distance should be calculated in assessing the outturn of work and they were emphatically of the opinion that the interval between the test stage and the declaration of famine should be the minimum possible. If, after 15 days, it was found that the test works done did not draw enough number of people, well, they might close the works and treat them as ordinary works. They went on to say that if the test works attracted a large number of people, then the works should be converted into relief works. I am quite aware of the fact that there is no categorical mention of the period within which a test work should be converted into a relief work. But, anybody who goes through the whole report, through the terms of the subsequent reference to the Committee, the order passed on that report and the report of the Committee and the modifications effected in the Famine Code, cannot but come to the conclusion that it was never contemplated that the test period should be prolonged to as long as two months, as it has been done in the present stage. In fact, you find in the Committee's report: ' We wish further to emphasize the fact that there should be no avoidable delay in converting test works into relief works '. That was the report of the Committee. At that time, there was an impression on the part of certain Government officials that the test works should continue as long as two months at least. About this, the Committee's view was—and the Government also agreed with the Committee—' in the tracts visited, we have noticed a mistaken impression on the part of some officials that the period of two months above referred to applies not only to the distribution of gratuitous relief, but also to the continuous attendance of a large number of workers. To avoid undesirable results of this misconception, we suggest the insertion of an explanatory note at the foot of the section '. In regard to the declaration of relief works, they gave power to the Board to say that the test works should be converted into relief works. They further stated, ' to go further, i.e., to seek in addition Government's approval for the conversion of the test works into relief work is in our opinion to court delay in a matter which brooks none and possibly to impose needless suffering at a stage when it has to be avoided most '. That is the remark of the Committee in this matter and the Government also agreed with them and modified the section in the Famine Code accordingly. Now, when all that has been done, it seems rather strange that the Government should be hesitating over this matter.

" The other day, the hon. the Revenue Member went over this area, and I dare say he has visited some of the places and seen many of the conditions under which these people work. He might probably have seen one or two coolies in a gang not working for full time. Probably, they had gone after the day's work of eight hours or after finishing their work early, or they might have gone to pick up some fuel for cooking. But, to base upon that general conclusion and to say that the people are not in need of any relief, I think, would be dangerous. The Famine Code does not give them anything for procuring fuel. I do not think the hon. the Revenue Member went into all the details of the matter or tried to find out the special circumstances under which the particular gang which he saw closed their work early and went away. Whatever it

2nd August 1932] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

may be, the very fact that as many as 12,000 people are working here day after day for a small wage shows conclusively that real distress exists there and there can be no reason whatsoever for delaying the conversion of these test works into relief works.

"In the Press Communiqué of the 29th June 1932, Government say that they have not seen signs of emaciation on the part of these people and so they would wait for some time more before they convert these test works into relief works. I think this is a dangerous position on the part of the Government to take, and it would be dangerous to wait for four or five months. I would also like to remind the hon. the Revenue Member that the Government should not think that the present famine policy is really to wait for emaciation and then give relief. Order on the report of the Committee is clear and the Government's principal business in famine relief has now come to be rather one of dealing with the unemployed and not of dealing with the absence or scarcity of food supplies. That was the position taken up by Government in 1923. I presume the Government have not changed their attitude since. Sir, in other countries, in England for example, unemployed are given cash doles, without any work being exacted. There the unemployed get about 15 sh. a week without doing anything to earn it. Here, we do not give the people anything without getting work from them in return for the money paid. All that is asked for is, give the people some work to do and then pay them, not what they would be getting in normal times, but just enough to enable them to make both ends meet. The wage that is given to these people is merely a subsistence wage and is not even sufficient for the actual needs of the worker concerned. It is not enough to feed the dependents of the people or the disabled persons dependent on them. I would only appeal to the Government to give up their indifferent, unsympathetic attitude in this matter and lose no time in ending this test work and beginning regular relief works." 1 p.m.

* Mr. G. Lakshmana Reddi:—"Mr. President, Sir, I wish to speak a few words on this motion, and in doing so I should like to bring to the notice of the Government that the Ceded districts are hard hit in the matter of irrigation facilities. I think we ought to have got the Tungabhadra Scheme long before the Mettur Project. (Laughter.) Because, Sir, our parts have entirely to depend on rainfall for cultivation, and it is a well-known fact that we do not get sufficient rainfall in our parts. Of course, there are some tanks; they came into existence in the old, old days; but most of them have become silted up and our kind Government have not taken any steps to remove the accumulated silt, so much so these tanks are now of no use for cultivating crops.

"Then, Sir, some of our rivers are dammed up; the Pennar, the Hagari, the Jayamangali and the Chitravati are dammed up by the Mysore Government contrary to the agreement between the British Government and the Mysore Government. We have approached the British Government to see that that agreement is given effect to, but till now nothing has been done.

"Then, Sir, the Tungabhadra Project is hanging in the air and it is not known when it will become an accomplished fact. As such, I

[Mr. G. Lakshmana Reddi] [2nd August 1932

request Government to realize that it is high time that something should be done by way of irrigation facilities to the ryots of the Ceded districts.

"With these words I support the motion."

* The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"Mr. President, Sir, some hon. Members on the other side of the House have referred to irrigation projects to benefit the Ceded districts and more especially to the Tungabhadra Project. They were anxious that that scheme should be pushed through, and they said that they would like to know how that scheme stands. I have on several previous occasions explained that we are carrying on negotiations with the Hyderabad Government and also with the Bombay Government and the Mysore Government, which are also affected by the scheme as the waters of the Tungabhadra pass through their territories or along their borders. I can assure hon. Members that I have been taking a personal interest in furthering this project. (Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: 'Hear hear.') Some time ago when I was acting as Irrigation Member I laid a suggestion to the Chief Engineer that we should endeavour to find another site for the main reservoir which would avoid submerging a portion of the Hyderabad territory either by making the dam higher up the river or by storing water in a reservoir not on the river itself, as in the case of the Sangam Project on the Pennar. These proposals were investigated and an alternative site for a dam on the river was selected. The erection of this dam will however lead to the submergence of a portion of Mysore State and Bombay presidency and we shall have to negotiate with them instead of the Hyderabad Government if that site is finally adopted. It appeared however possible that a joint scheme could be devised in the execution of which the Hyderabad Government might co-operate with us. I went to Hyderabad and placed this proposal before that Government and I am glad to say that they expressed their readiness to investigate this proposal and suggested that we should have a general investigation. Since then, the Hyderabad Government have, I believe, been investigating the possibility of utilizing Tungabhadra water on their side of the river, and I hope before long they will be in a position to forward their proposals, and then we can have a joint investigation of the scheme, as a result of which I hope that something may be done which will benefit the country on both sides of the river. That is the present position of the scheme. I can only now repeat, what I have already said, that I am most anxious to see this project pushed forward. I do realize the vital importance of the scheme to the people of the Ceded districts in the area affected by the project; and it is my desire that we should be able to start the Tungabhadara Project as soon as the Mettur Project is completed, so that we can utilize on the former much of the machinery that is being now used on the latter. That has been my aim all along and I can assure hon. Members that the scheme is being pushed forward as speedily as possible.

"As regards the damming up of the Pennar and the Hagari, the Local Government are carrying on correspondence with the Mysore

2nd August 1932] [Sir Archibald Campbell]

Government in that matter and endeavouring to set matters right in accordance with the Agreement which was signed many years ago by the Mysore and Madras Governments.

"As regards the Famine Code, to which Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar and Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar referred as being somewhat out of date and founded on conditions which no longer exist, I would remind them that though the Famine Code was started when conditions were very different from the present, it has been modified from time to time and has been considerably revised in comparatively recent years. We have taken into consideration the fact that communications have very much improved of late, thereby affecting the supply of grains and foodstuffs to all parts of the Presidency; we no longer depend for indications of famine upon local prices, because they are generally determined now more by outside conditions than by those subsisting in the particular areas concerned. I can remember days when we had to report periodically, I think once a month or once a week, whether famine price level had been reached. Those days are now gone, as that is no longer regarded as an adequate test. The object of the Famine Code is to prevent the waste of Government money in giving relief where it is really not necessary. It is the practice here for agricultural workers to receive such wages during the agricultural season as would enable them to tide over the slack season. The landowners and the ryots have to pay wages accordingly. I am quite sure if we started a work in the middle of the Kistna Delta in March or April we should get a certain number of people to come to it. Test works, admittedly, do not give such good conditions as full relief work, which are started only when it has been decided that it is necessary for the Government to do everything in its power to save people from starvation.

"Now, as regards the conditions existing in the Bellary district I recently paid a visit there. Various works are being carried out. These are road works and are useful; they will be handed over to local boards which will, I hope, complete and maintain them. These works are being carried out as test works under the Famine Code. As I have already observed the rates are raised 25 per cent over the rates provided in the Famine Code, because the price of condiments has not fallen to the same extent as that of the staple food, cholam. I went round some of the works. There are nominally seven test works; in fact, there are really 13 works, some of the works being clubbed together, though separated by some miles. I also visited certain villages and a market on market-day and made all sorts of inquiries. The works have only been recently organized as test works. The test works are cheaper now than when they were in the hands of the local board, as the board was paying higher rates of wages. During the last month the work of organization has been going on, but this cannot be done very easily and it is only now that the organization is becoming satisfactory. Auditors have only been recently appointed by the Accountant-General. It requires a certain amount of time to organize the works and administration so as to ensure that Government money is spent economically and that wages are fully paid to the coolies.

[Sir Archibald Campbell] [2nd August 1932

"Well, Sir, I found the condition of the people everywhere to be, what I would call, normal. There is no reason to think that they are unduly suffering. I do not say that if we had not taken these measures the people would not be in a worse condition than they are now. But I cannot say that I am satisfied that it is necessary that we should convert these works into relief works.

"As regards the particular works to which my hon. Friend referred, I found the labourers leaving the works early, about 2-30 or 3 o'clock. I inquired of them why they were going away so early and they replied that they were going for their meals and would come back; on inquiry, however I learnt they never did return after going off for their meals in the afternoon. I heard complaints on that work that the labourers were earning only one anna six pies instead of two annas one pie, and on inquiry I found the real cause to be what I have just narrated. There is no necessity for them to go away early and they could earn more if they stopped the whole day at the work."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"Is it a daily-wage system, or a piece-wage system?"

* The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"A combination of both. If they had done their task they get a full wage, and if they go away before doing the full task, they are paid less according to the amount of work done.

"Another work I found on the same road some three or four miles off. There too I found workmen going away at 3-30. In consequence, I must say I had some doubt whether it is necessary to keep that test work any longer, but as I was told that there was only a little more earth work to be done—there are only two gaps to be filled—and that it will take a fortnight or so to finish the work, I told the Collector that it is not necessary to close it at once, but the earthwork might be completed first."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I know whether there is no limit to their hours of work? Are they to work all the 12 hours?"

1-15 p.m. * The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"In most of the works they come about 8 o'clock or later and leave at about 4-30 or 5, I believe. On one work I visited there was nobody on the work at all in the afternoon. I was not going to mention that case as in that particular case there had been a very heavy shower of rain which would have rendered work very difficult. As regards the other works, I found the gangs were generally earning the full wage allowed by the Code. At the same time the condition of the people either on the works or in the villages was not such as to indicate the necessity for the immediate conversion of the test works into relief works. As I mentioned, the gangs are divided into three classes with different wages and work and the gangs are formed according to the work to be done. Recently we had a census report on wages. This census was held once in five years. In last year's report I find in the Bellary district the wages paid in cash to men who were sowers and transplanters were As. 2-11 in black-soil tracts and

2nd August 1932] [Sir Archibald Campbell]

As. 3 in red soil tracts and As. 3-8 in the Tungabhadra channel area. The area affected is mainly black cotton soil and that is why there is not much cultivation going on there now. If the labourers are paid in grain their wage is As. 2-1 in both black and red soil tracts. Women's wages are As. 2-2 and As. 2-1 in cash and As. 1-2 and As. 1-8 in grain. For reaping and harvesting, the cash wages are a little higher, being for men As. 3-2 in black soil and As. 3-5 in red soils. The cash wages for women are As. 2-5 in both soils. I am quoting these to show that the wages now paid on the test works are not very low. During the period of test we are justified in presuming that the people have some resources left; it is not desirable for the Government to take the place of the landlord or the ryot and relieve him of the duty of paying adequate wages by maintaining the labouring classes during the off-season. It is the custom of the country for the agricultural labourers to be paid such wages during the working season as will enable them to tide over the slack season. I can assure the House that we are watching the situation very carefully. The area is not far from the headquarters of the Bellary district and the Collector has easy access to the various works. The Government have displayed considerable sympathy towards this district in the last few years. The communiqué to which my hon. Friend referred will show that we have recently remitted 4½ lakhs of rupees of land revenue and suspended till next year the collection of 2½ lakhs of rupees. We have also been very generous in the matter of loans. I am asking for this grant to enable us to provide, till the next meeting of the Legislative Council, work for the labouring classes in the Bellary district on the present lines; if rains come we may be able to close the works. We have to bear in mind that we must neither make the labouring classes suffer nor waste Government money."

The motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

The demand was put and carried and the grant made.

IX.—THE ORISSA COMMITTEE REPORT.

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move—

'*that the Report of the Orissa Committee be taken into consideration.*'"

Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—"I rise to a point of order. It is said that the motion is made under rule 24-A. That rule I fear does not apply here. No reference has been made by the Government of India under section 52-A. This Council is not competent to consider the question. It is a central subject and this Council has nothing to do with it and it does not appear from the communications received that the Government of India has made any reference to the opinion of this Council."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Will the hon. Member point out whether the reference of the Government of India is necessary for a motion like this?"

[2nd August 1932

Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—" Section 52 says that the Government of India may after obtaining the expression of opinion of the Local Government and the local legislature affected, etc."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" Mr. President, Sir, the point raised by the hon. Member for Ganjam is entirely beside the point. In respect of an act which the Governor-General in Council may be doing in order to constitute a new Governor's province that section operates. But in regard to placing the subject before the Legislative Council for elucidating its opinion upon some subject it is entirely for the Local Government to place it before the Council. If this motion is put under Rule 24-A it is only in regard to the precedence in the agenda. It does not affect the subject matter. It is with regard to the precedence; otherwise it should come like an ordinary motion. But in a Government motion it is left to the Government to choose the place in the agenda."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" I do not think the hon. Member from Ganjam has properly appreciated the significance of Rule 24-A. Rule 24-A deals with the question of the power of the Legislative Council to discuss motions other than resolutions and certain other matters. Further this motion does not contain any reference to the Governor-General and it mainly places before the House the report of the Orissa Committee for consideration. I do not think therefore that any objection need be raised to get through the discussion of this motion."

Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—" I raise another point of order. This Orissa Committee report relates not only to Madras areas but also areas outside Madras Presidency. This Council at any rate has no power to consider the whole report."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" I think the hon. Member is aware that as far as this Province is affected by the Report of the Orissa Committee, this House is entitled to discuss it and therefore the objection that he has raised is quite out of order."

At this stage the House rose for lunch.

After Lunch—(2-30 p.m.).

* The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" Mr. President, Sir, the question of forming a separate province for the Oriya races, so as to include in one province the people of the Oriya races who are scattered in different provinces at present, has been considered at various times since the beginning of this century. More recently, it was considered by the Statutory Commission and again at the Round Table Conference, and finally the consideration assumed a definite form by the appointment last September by the Government of India of a small committee to examine and report on the financial and other consequences of setting up a separate administration for Orissa, and to make recommendations regarding the boundaries in the event of separation. Volume I of the Report was published in April and Volume II has not yet reached this Government, and presumably has not been placed at the disposal of the public. It is however most desirable that the recommendations made in this Report should be dealt with as quickly as possible, for on the decision whether there is to be a separate province for Oriyas must

2nd August 1932] [Sir Archibald Campbell]

necessarily depend the strength of the Legislative Council in this province and in the other provinces affected, and also the distribution of membership among the various communities if the system of separate electorates is still maintained. We all know that the Government are most anxious to press forward with the measures necessary for the introduction of new Reforms, and it is essential all such matters should be settled with the least possible delay. The Government of India have in the ordinary course asked for our views on this Report, and have intimated that they would welcome a discussion in this Council and will be glad to be informed of the proceedings here. It seemed to me that the best way of bringing about a discussion in this House was to bring forward this motion. But, in doing so, I have not made any definite proposals, and I do not propose that the official Members should express any definite views as to what the decision should be, or that they should vote on one side or the other, should an occasion arise for voting in the House. Certain proposals will be made, I understand, by hon. Members, and it was my intention that such amendments should be moved on my present motion.

"I will briefly summarize the proposals which are made in the Report. The Committee considered the various areas in the provinces which might possibly be included in the new Orissa province, and recommended that the new province should include three districts of the present Orissa, namely, Cuttack, Puri and Balasore, and also the area known as Angul which consists of the Angul subdivision and the Khond Mahals. They also recommended the inclusion of Khariar Zamindari in the Central Provinces with an area of 1,500 square miles and a population of 160,000 which the Committee describes as an extremely backward area. The only other area now in the Central Provinces which according to the Committee's proposals will be included in the new province is the Padampur tract which consists of 61 villages. The rest of the new province will include portions of the Ganjam district and agency and of the Vizagapatam Agency. The whole of the new province will have an area of about 33,000 square miles, of which 18,000 or rather more than half is to be provided from the Madras Presidency. The total population in the new province will be about $8\frac{1}{4}$ millions, of which $2\frac{3}{4}$ millions, or one-third, will be provided from the Ganjam and Vizagapatam Agency including the Jeypore Zamindari.

"Now, we are mainly concerned to-day, as many hon. Members have already remarked, with those portions which are to be transferred from this Presidency. I was anxious to get a map prepared to illustrate the proposals of the Committee, but I have not been able to do so. The area proposed to be transferred from the Madras Presidency includes almost the whole of the Ganjam district except the area on the south-east of Berhampur; Berhampur is to be transferred to the new province; also the Parlakimedi Zamindari and a portion of the Vizagapatam Agency including the Jeypore Zamindari.

"In considering the proposals for the administration of the new province, the Committee seem to have done their best to devise a system which will be as economical as possible. The administration will be

[Sir Archibald Campbell] [2nd August 1932

in the hands of a Governor and two Ministers. The seat of Government will be at Cuttack. There will be two Secretaries to Government; one Revenue Commissioner, who will also be in charge of Forests, Excise, Registration, Land Records and Stamps; seven District Officers; two District Judges; a Development Commissioner in charge of the Agriculture, Veterinary, Co-operative and Industries departments; one Chief Engineer who will also be the Secretary to Government; an Inspector-General of Prisons and Civil Hospitals will also be the Director of Public Health; a Director of Public Instruction and an Inspector-General of Police. The number of superior officers is kept as small as possible. The All-India Service officers are to be borrowed from the neighbouring provinces; that will involve the disadvantage that they will not be acquainted with the Oriya language when first posted to the Province but they will no doubt soon acquaint themselves with it after they have been in office for some time.

" The financial position which the Committee arrived at is as follows: They estimate the basic revenue, as they call it, at 136·58 lakhs, and the basic expenditure at 152·50 lakhs. They add on to the latter the cost of the creation of the new administration, such as, the pay of the Governor, the Ministers and so on. The Committee has put the pay of the Governor and the Ministers as low as possible, but the extra cost involved is 18·23 lakhs. This makes the deficit in the first year one of 34·15 lakhs, or allowing for normal expansion of expenditure, the deficit will be 35·21 lakhs in the first year. The Committee anticipates that this deficit will rise in the course of fifteen years to 40·93 lakhs, or practically 41 lakhs. They point out that the deficit cannot be met by the imposition of new taxes, but must be met by the allocation of new sources of revenue or by subventions from the Central Government, or by a combination of both these methods.

" Now, as I have already mentioned, the Committee has been as economical as possible in devising the form of administration, and with that end in view they propose that the new province should take advantage of various institutions in the neighbouring provinces. They are going to call upon various provinces for assistance in this direction. For instance, they will look to Nagpur and Cawnpore for agricultural training; they will look to Bengal for chemical examinations, for the inspection of boilers, for the training of assistant surgeons and so on; they will look to Bihar for a very considerable amount of assistance, especially in such matters as the training of sanitary inspectors, public health laboratories, the school of mines, Police training colleges, the reformatory school, the mental hospital, the Indian schools of medicine and in particular they will look to Patna for its University and the Law College, the Medical College, the Veterinary College, the Engineering College and last but not the least for its High Court. It is proposed that the Judges of the Patna High Court should proceed from Patna on circuit to the new province, but the Judicial Officers who are to belong to the Bihar cadre will be called upon to administer the local laws of three different provinces.

2nd August 1932] [Sir Archibald Campbell]

"As regards the reasons for these proposals, I will refer hon. Members to paragraph 62 of the report from which it will be seen that it is admitted that the Madras Government has in the past dealt sympathetically with the difficulties of the Oriyas. That has always been admitted when this question has been under consideration. But none the less there is the desire amongst the Oriyas that they should come under one Provincial Government and should be not scattered about in different provinces.

"The Committee summarizes its conclusion as follows:— 2-45 p.m.

> 'Nevertheless, the origin of the demand for re-union with Orissa is not to be found in any specific grievances against the present administration. The desire of the educated Oriyas of Ganjam to be included in a separate province of Orissa is genuine and strong; but it is inspired by the ties of race, language, and history, of which they have become increasingly conscious during the last thirty years.'

"My desire in making this motion, as I already said, is to give the members of this House an opportunity to express their views both on the general proposal that a new province should be formed and on the questions whether any area of this province should be transferred to this new province and, if so, what its boundaries should be. Members of the House will, no doubt, consider whether the conclusions which the Committee has drawn from the evidence before it have been correctly drawn, for example, as regards the classification of certain castes as Oriya or Telugu as the case may be, or as to whether Ganjam or Vizagapatam is historically more connected with Orissa than with this province. The House must also consider the proposed administrative arrangements and especially their effect on the portion of the Madras Presidency to be transferred to the new province. Another important question which the House will have to consider is the financial solvency of the new province and the effect of the proposed transfer of an area to the new province on the finances of this Presidency. Finally the House should consider whether in view of the admitted desire of the Oriyas for a separate province, a separate province should be formed in spite of the difficulties attendant on its formation and if so what area should be transferred from this Presidency. It is not desirable to discuss all these matters in too much detail, though I have to some extent summarized the details and endeavoured to give the members of the House a general outline, of the proposals of the committee."

The hon. Mr. H. G. Stokes:—"I second the motion."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"Mr. President, Sir, I rise to move the motion of which I have given notice, namely:

> '*That the consideration of the Report of the Orissa Committee be adjourned to the next meeting of the Council and that in the meanwhile volumes II and III of the Report be made available to Members of this Council.*'

"Sir, I do not want to dilate much on this adjournment motion. The hon. the Revenue Member has merely stated in the motion which he has tabled that the Report be taken into consideration. I do not think that would be the proper form when we read the section of the Government of India Act, 52-A. It is clear that on such questions the

[Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed] [2nd August 1932

House should be asked to express a definite opinion on the matter and the motion should have been tabled in that form. Probably I should have raised the point much earlier, but all the same I think it is worth mentioning that the form through which the hon. Member seeks our opinion is not the proper form. We should have been asked to express our opinion and time should have been given to us to consider the report and also enable us to make up our minds as to what exactly should be our opinion on points which are so controversial as those contained in the Report. For one thing, Mr. President, I do not know how the hon. the Revenue Member will meet the point that he has not supplied to us copies of the report more than two days prior to the actual date of the meeting. For my part I received a copy of the report, volume I only, on Saturday noon, and even up to this date we have not been furnished with copies of the rest of the volumes. It might be said by some hon. Members of this House that volumes 2 and 3 are not material, but I beg to differ from any gentleman who holds any such view. In fact, references are made in volume I to volumes II and III. In the first place, I have not had the time even cursorily to go through the report, secondly references are made in volume I to facts and figures in volumes II and III. More than that, it is absolutely essential for the members of the House to express an opinion that they should read volume I in conjunction with volumes II and III. These volumes contain the recorded evidence of the Committee and also the written memoranda submitted to it by various persons interested in the question. Further, there are various references to maps, that seem to have been prepared by the Committee or at their instance; and the maps will exactly show where the territory lies which has to be transferred, and which territory it is that is in dispute, which part of the taluk or district that will go to make a new province and so on. Perhaps by a notification circulated to us this morning, two or three maps seem to have been hung in the Legislative Council Library. We were not aware when they were brought and placed at the library. We came to know of this only after coming to this House.

"Now, in the report, references have been made to blocks 2 and 3 in various places. It is not possible for us to find out which is block 1 or which is block A or which is block B. Two or three maps placed in the library without any previous notice cannot enable us to give any intelligent expression to our opinion, on such an important question like this.

"Then again, Sir, I submit that on a question like this, it was not enough that the Report should have been published in the newspapers. Members could not be expected to read the newspaper and come prepared to express their opinion merely on such reading. If at least the hon. the Revenue Member had the courtesy to intimate to us through the Legislative Council office that he was going to make a motion within 15 or 20 clear days, then we could have written to the Secretary for copies of the Report and they could have been made available to us earlier than has been actually done. The notice itself came from the office of the Legislative Council very late, and we had no opportunity

2nd August 1932] [Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed]

to go through the Report and the other volumes of the Report which have not yet been placed either in the library or in the possession of the members of the House. I do not want to go into the merits of the question, because I am merely moving a motion for adjournment. There are certain friends of mine in this House who think that in requesting the House to defer consideration of the Report I am putting a spoke in the wheel of an Oriya province being formed and that the Andhras are going to lose the advantage which they are now trying to get in the shape of retaining certain taluks of certain districts proposed to be transferred to the new province of Orissa. Now, Sir, the bone of contention between the two parties, the Oriyas and the Andhras, seems to be concentrated on certain tracts of the Madras Presidency. The point as to whether that contention was tenable or not, the amendment that is on the table of the House, namely, the amendment given notice of by the Raja of Bobbili, definitely makes clear as to what exactly is aimed at by that amendment. It goes far beyond what has been recommended by the Committee itself. That being the case, it is necessary that we should wait for the other two volumes of the Report not yet published and also must have time to study the maps referred to therein. On these grounds I would urge on the House to defer consideration of the Report. After all, the delay of a month or two is not going to matter much, and I do not think any great loss will be sustained by any of the parties concerned. Two months' time is nothing when we consider that this agitation has been going on since the year 1901, and in spite of efforts made by the Government time and again, this question has not been settled. Two months' delay will not matter much, and within that time, we shall be able to form a definite opinion as to what exactly are the respective claims and how far each party is justified in trying to get what they think is their due. For these reasons, I urge on the House to support my motion."

* Mr. V. T. Arasu:—" Mr. President, I have great pleasure in seconding the motion of my hon. Friend, Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed. We received the Report, not on Saturday as pointed out by Mr. Basheer Ahmed, but on Sunday morning. Therefore we have had no time whatever to read the Report and come to any sort of conclusion. There is another reason why the consideration of the subject should be postponed. As would be remembered by the hon. Members of this House, the hon. Member for Ganjam, the Raja of Parlakimedi, was responsible for suggesting the formation of a new Oriya province. It was at his instance, and as a result of his speech at the Round Table Conference, that His Majesty's Government have constituted a committee to go into the question. Unfortunately, the Raja Sahib is not here to-day to give his opinion on account, I understand, of the death of his mother. There is also another reason why this House should wait until the Raja Sahib is able to be present here to express his views on this question. In the Report of the O'Donnell Committee, there are some allegations made against the Raja Sahib. The allegations are that the Raja Sahib has brought undue influence to bear on some of the witnesses who gave evidence before that Committee. I am

[Mr. V. T. Arasu] [2nd August 1932

therefore of opinion that it is but fair and proper that this House should hear the Raja of Parlakimedi on this important question. For these reasons I strongly support the motion made by my Friend Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed."

3 p.m. * The RAJA OF KALLIKOTE :—" Sir, I rise to support the motion so ably moved and seconded by the hon. Members of the Opposition. Volume II of the Report which contains several particulars including maps showing the population of the different areas and other information that will be useful is not yet before us. Of course volume III containing the evidence, according to orders of the Government of India, will not be published and so we are only concerned with volumes I and II. Even volume I came into my hands only a week ago and other hon. Members only got it on Saturday. Because I am particularly interested I managed to get this earlier. Nobody has had the time to study it and come to definite conclusions. From the correspondence I am having with a Calcutta firm I am told that the second volume is not yet printed.

" Apart from these considerations the absence of the Raja Sahib of Parlakimedi is a great handicap to us. There seems to be the biggest controversy as to whether the Parlakimedi Estate should or should not be included in the proposed province. Several statements have been made in favour and against the proposal and even allegations have been made against the Raja Sahib. It is therefore fair and reasonable that he should be given a chance to put forward his case. Besides, the Raja Sahib moved this question at the Round Table Conference and he was also an Associate Member of the Committee whose Report is before us. He realizes the importance of the situation and would have certainly been here to-day, but unfortunately owing to certain recent domestic calamities he has been deprived of this opportunity. This seems to be an additional ground in support of the motion and in view of the fact that the material before us is defective for want of the second volume, I would appeal to the House and the hon. Members of Government not to press for the motion but to agree to adjourn the consideration until the next meeting of the Council."

* The RAJA OF BOBBILI :—" Sir, in rising to oppose the motion before the House I wish to say that every one is aware that this question has been engaging the public attention very seriously ever since the Committee was formed and especially more so ever since the Report was published.

" I find, especially since the Report was published, that this question has been seriously agitating the minds of the public of both the provinces. I also feel that not only in the interests of the public but also in the interests of every one concerned, it is desirable that this question should be decided as early as possible. I am no doubt sorry that the Raja Sahib of Parlakimedi is unable to attend the present session and present his case to-day. If it had been possible to give such an opportunity to him in the remaining few days of this Council,

2nd August 1932] [The Raja of Bobbili]

I would have never opposed this motion for adjournment. As I understand, the position is that the Council may be called into being in October or November. By that time I presume the Government of India will have formulated their proposals and sent them both to the Consultative Committee and to the Home Government. It is the special privilege of this House that it should express its opinion before final proposals for the formation of a new Oriya province are made. There are areas in the Oriya province which are bound up by ties of race, religion and language with the territories in this Province for many centuries and it is now proposed in this Report to cut them away from the rest of the Province. Having had the honour of representing Vizagapatam district including the Agency tracts, it is my duty to place before this House the strong feelings of the people of those districts if the Committee's proposals for the formation of a Oriya province are carried into effect. But I do not propose to speak on the merits of the report on the adjournment motion now before the House. My submission to the House is that as there is no other opportunity for this House to express its opinion on this report and as the fate of several millions of people of this Province is going to be decided before very long, it is necessary that both the Consultative Committee and the Government should have the valuable opinion of this House before them. It is therefore necessary that this House should express its opinion on the motion moved by the hon. the Revenue Member now. With these few words I strongly oppose the motion."

* Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi:—"Mr. President, although indisposed still, yet I am constrained to intervene in this debate on account of the importance of the matter. Having received Volume I of the Report only a couple of days back, and having had no time to study it or do full justice to it, we cannot be expected to express our opinion on this important matter in a proper manner. In fact, many of us only had a cursory glance of the Report. Fain would I therefore support the motion of my hon. Friend Mr. Basheer Ahmed for the postponement of the consideration of this matter until the next meeting, but my difficulty is: when is the next meeeting to come off? Somebody said it would be in September, another in October, a third in November, and a fourth in January. I am afraid we shall have to wait till Greek Kalends. That is why I am obliged to oppose my Friend's motion. I do not mean in any way to discourage my Oriya brethren in their attempt to have their own Province. On the other hand I wish them good luck. With all the revenue they could scrape from that arid land, I am afraid they will be put to an initial additional expenditure of over Rs. 50 lakhs which the Imperial Government or the Federal Government or the Central Government—call it whatever you like—will be obliged to shell out, if the proposal to create a Oriya province were to become a *fait accompli*. Again not only initial expenditure, but also a large recurring expenditure they will have to bear. It may be said that I am just entering on the merits of the case but my submission is that certainly we Andhras, all of us, here and elsewhere, would be very happy if our Oriya brethren had a Province

[Mr. C. Kolanda Reddi] [2nd August 1932

of their own, because we had been fighting for the last two decades for an Andhra province. Our difficulty is that instead of getting a province for ourselves we are being dismembered. According to the recommendation of the majority Report a large slice of the Telugu country is proposed to be tacked on to the Orissa province."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member will confine his remarks to the motion under discussion."

Rai Sahib C. KOLANDA REDDI:—"If the hon. the Revenue Member assures us that he will give us an early opportunity for discussing this important matter, I shall have no objection to support the motion of my hon. Friend Mr. Basheer Ahmed. Otherwise it must be proceeded with now."

* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"I also oppose this adjournment motion. At first sight one would naturally wish that this motion should be supported. I quite realize that the Report was distributed very late and probably when the second and third volumes are available we will be in a better position to come to definite conclusions. But our real difficulty is whether our opinion is going to have any value at all. I am afraid unless we express our opinion on the Report now, it is not likely that our opinion will be considered at all at any future time. If the hon. the Revenue Member assures us that a chance will be given to us, say that we will have an opportunity of expressing our opinion in a month or so, then we can support this motion. But if there is no certainty of the Council meeting in the near future, then our opinion expressed at any distant future will not have any value, because by the time the rest of the Report is printed and published the Government of India will have made their proposals. The strength of feeling among the Telugu-speaking population is very strong and they are of opinion that the recommendations of the Orissa Committee ought not to be given effect to, and that the considered opinion of this House should be sent in time to the Government of India. But for this reason I would certainly not have opposed this motion. Most of us are anxious that this question should be settled. Although the Report is big, the pages that concern Madras are very few and most of the pages are occupied by financial statistics. Most of the pages concern other Provinces. So it will not be difficult for us to come to conclusions on this report."

* Mr. A. V. BHANOJI RAO:—"I rise to oppose this motion, because the reason given by my hon. Friend Mr. Basheer Ahmed is not at all convincing. He said that the first volume came to his hand only on Saturday. I am sure that the hon. Mover knows that this controversy had been going on for the last six months or one year and all people know that Oriyas are preparing their case. I may tell for the information of the House when Mr. Patnaik and myself were travelling in the same train, and when I asked him as to what the various books and papers which he had were he replied they were all about the Oriya question. So he cannot say that people are not prepared to express their opinion on this matter now.

2nd August 1932] [Mr. A. V. Bhanoji Rao]

" The second volume contains nothing but the evidence. As regards the maps they were hung up yesterday in the Council Library and if hon. Members had taken a little interest they would have known that they relate to the motion that would come before the House to-day. The reasons advanced by several hon. Members in support of the motion for adjournment are not convincing. I am afraid that unless this Council expresses its opinion on the question now, the Government of Madras will be put in a very delicate position when they have to report to the Government of India on this subject, and further new constitutions will be introduced for the various provinces very shortly. Unless the Government of India have the definite opinion of this Council on this subject, they will not be able to prepare a scheme for the formation of various linguistic provinces. I am afraid if this subject is not considered now, it cannot come up before the House for some time more and the case may go by default for not having expressed our opinion in time. Under these circumstances, as both the Andhras and the Oriyas are prepared and have come down here, fully prepared, I think the motion for adjournment must be opposed very strongly." 3-15 p.m.

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan :—" Mr. President, Sir, while opposing the motion for adjournment one or two hon. Members said that the case may go by default. I am afraid they are not aware of the fact that the Government of India have not asked this Government to elicit the opinion of this Council on the question of the formation of an Oriya province. Under section 52-A of the Government of India Act, it is incumbent on the Government of India to consult this House before they can constitute any new Governor's or Lieutenant Governor's province. Therefore those who apprehend that the case may go by default do not know that the motion now put forward by the Madras Government is not done at the instance of the Government of India.

" The next question is when the next meeting of the Council will be held. I suggest that if the Government of India asks for the opinion of this Council, the Government of Madras will arrange for an early meeting of this House to enable it to express an opinion on the subject. Therefore the case will not go by default if we do not express our opinion now. Moreover, we have not had sufficient time to thoroughly consider the pros and cons of the question as the Report was put into our hands only recently. It is a very important question and therefore I think it is better that the discussion is postponed. It was said that hon. Members who will be affected by the formation of this province are already aware of the facts. But I should like to point out to them that it is not only the opinion of the Oriya or the Andhra members that are affected by this question but the opinion of the Council as a whole. The whole Presidency will be affected if you take away a district here and a district there. For these reasons, I support the motion for adjournment."

* Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo :—" Mr. President, Sir, it is admitted on all hands that members are not fully prepared to consider the question at present. I am also not prepared to do full justice to

the subject. Even the hon. the Revenue Member said that for want of time he could not prepare the map showing the tracts proposed to be transferred. (Interruption.) I heard you say like that. If that is so everybody is not prepared. Of course one gentleman said—he spoke not only on behalf of the Andhras but also on behalf of the Oriyas though he is only an Andhra—that the rival parties were thoroughly prepared to deal with the question now. I do not know where he got this information from. If I had the opportunity I should like to cross-examine him and show that he has not studied this subject well. Unfortunately I cannot do it. The only ground on which the Andhras want this question to be rushed through in this House now is that the Government of India without consulting the Madras Government and the Madras Council may recommend a scheme to the Secretary of State, get his approval and notify the creation of a new Oriya province. I am afraid they are drawing too much upon their imagination to say so. I am certain that the Government of India will realize their responsibility and call upon this Government and this Council to express their opinions knowing full well that this Government have always been unsympathetically opposed to the transfer of these tracts to a new Oriya province."

Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi:—"On a point of order, Mr. President, are we now discussing the question of the transfer of these tracts?"

Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo:—"I know I am quite in order. Reference was made to this question before by several hon. Members and by the hon. Member who raises this point of order.

"As has been pointed out, this Council has got the right, except under section 52-A, to express its opinion on the question before it is finally decided. Therefore nothing will be lost if the consideration of this subject is postponed.

"Moreover the Oriyas are in a hopeless minority in this House whereas the Andhras are in a very powerful position as is seen from the way in which they are represented in the House and in the various offices held by them. If this motion is lost it will show the tyranny of the majority over a helpless minority. If the Andhras have any sense of fairplay I think they will agree to this adjournment motion and urge upon the Government to have the next meeting of the Council as early as possible to enable us to express a well considered opinion on the subject. Of course, if they wish to rush through they can easily do it, but that would be mere tyranny."

* The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"Sir, I do not wish to take up the time of the House in meeting the several arguments advanced either for or against the adjournment motion. But I should like to associate myself with my hon. Friend the Raja of Bobbili in regretting the absence of the Raja of Parlakimedi. But his views are well-known to members of the House. This matter is not certainly sprung on us. It has been under consideration for some years and we all know that it has been coming forward in an acute form at the present time. As

2nd August 1932] [Sir Archibald Campbell]

a matter of fact the appointment of this Committee was sufficient to show that an early decision was going to be taken on this subject. I am quite sure everyone interested in this question has been preparing arguments either in favour or against the transfer of certain parts of this Presidency to a new Oriya province. As regards the remarks of the last speaker, I am not sure how an adjournment will lessen the 'tyranny' as my hon. Friend expresses it, of the Andhras at a later date. I hope this debate will not develop into an acute racial dispute as foreshadowed by the remarks of the last speaker. I am quite sure that everyone in this House will deal with this question on broad considerations and not from personal considerations arising from his belonging to one race or another race. In any case there are besides the Andhras and the Oriyas a number of other hon. Members who can be trusted to arrive at a fair decision on the facts placed before them. I trust hon. Members will take such advantage as they can of the opportunity which I have given them to place their views before the Government and therefore before the Government of India and presumably before the Consultative Committee as well. It is most desirable that the House should take advantage of this opportunity to express their views now, as the next meeting of the Council is not likely to be held before November."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that the consideration of the Report of the Orissa Committee be adjourned to the next meeting of the Council and that in the meanwhile Volumes II and III of the Report be made available to the Members of the Council."

The question was put and declared lost. A poll was demanded and the House divided thus :— 3-30 p.m.

Ayes.

1. Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
2. ,, K. P. Raman Menon.
3. ,, P. Bayappa Reddi.
4. ,, T. Narasa Reddi.
5. Raja of Kallikote.
6. Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo.
7. Dr. P. Subbarayan.
8. Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar.
9. Rao Bahadur T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.
10. Khan Bahadur P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur.
11. Mr. A. B. Shetty.
12. ,, Abdul Hameed Khan.
13. ,, Basheer Ahmed Sayeed.
14. ,, Ahmed Miran.
15. ,, K. Nachiyappa Gounder.
16. ,, A. Pl. N. V. Nadimuthu Pillai.
17. ,, K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar.
18. ,, V. T. Arasu.
19. S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur.

Noes.

1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur.
2. ,, •Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishan Nayar.
3. ,, Sir Archibald Campbell.
4. ,, Mr. H. G. Stokes.
5. ,, Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar.
6. The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan.
7. ,, Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
8. Rao Bahadur G. Jagannatha Raju.
9. Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma.
10. Mr. C. E. Jones.
11. ,, J. A. Thorne.
12. ,, H. M. Hood.
13. ,, R. Madanagopal Nayudu.

[2nd August 1932

Noes—cont.

14. Mr. S. H. Slater.
15. ,, E. Conran Smith.
16. ,, T. Sundara Rao Nayudu.
17. Khan Sahib Syed Tajudin Sahib Bahadur.
18. Mr. M. D. T. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
19. ,, K. C. M. Venkatachala Reddiyar.
20. ,, G. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
21. ,, M. B. Rangaswami Reddi.
22. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.
23. Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar.
24. Mr. M. S. Sreshta.
25. ,, P. C. Moses.
26. ,, P. V. Rajagopala Pillai.
27. ,, C. Indrayya.
28. Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai.
29. Raja of Bobbili.
30. Kumararaja of Venkatagiri.
31. Zamindar of Mirzapuram.
32. Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.
33. ,, A. V. Bhanoji Rao.
34. ,, J. A. Davis.
35. ,, Daniel Thomas.
36. Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.
37. Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanya Chetti.
38. Zamindar of Kirlampudi.
39. Rao Sahib C. Jayaram Nayudu.
40. Zamindar of Chemudu.
41. Mr. D. V. Narasimhaswami.
42. Mr. A. Harischandrudu.
43. ,, K. Kesavaramamurti.
44. ,, Mahboob Ali Baig.
45. ,, Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
46. ,, M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.
47. ,, A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
48. ,, K. Koti Reddi.
49. ,, C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.
50. ,, F. G. Luker.
51. ,, A. W. Hutton.
52. ,, R. Foulkes.
53. ,, F. J. Stanes.
54. ,, F. E. James.
55. Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi.
56. Mr. J. Kuppuswami Choudari.
57. ,, C. Satyanarayana Choudari.
58. ,, C. Basu Dev.
59. Rao Sahib D. Krishnamurti.
60. Mr. A. Ramakrishna Reddi.
61. Khan Bahadur Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur.
62. Mr. G. Sriramulu.
63. ,, H. M. Jagannatham.
64. Rao Bahadur R. Srinivasan.
65. Mr. G. R. Premayya.
66. Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
67. Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur.
68. Mr. G. Lakshmana Reddi.
69. ,, C. Krishnan.
70. ,, P. Peddiraju.

Neutral.

1. Mr. B. P. Sesha Reddi.
2. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
3. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.
4. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar.
5. Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar.
6. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.

Ayes 19. *Noes* 70. *Neutral* 6.

The motion was lost.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Before proceeding with the further consideration of this motion, I wish to inform the House of the procedure that I propose to adopt. There are two ways of dealing with such a motion. Firstly, it may be dealt with on the analogy of a Bill where, after the motion for consideration is passed, individual amendments are taken up, discussed and voted upon. Secondly, as has been done on a previous occasion with reference to a similar kind of motion, the main motion and the amendments may be discussed together though voted upon separately. The latter procedure may entail repetition of ideas, the overlapping of arguments and much loss of time. The vote now recorded by the House on the motion of Mr. Basheer Ahmed indicates the sense of the House with regard to the main motion. If it is to the convenience of the House and if no serious objection is taken, I would adopt the former course and put the main motion to the vote of the House first. After that is carried the House may discuss the amendments which raise important issues and vote upon them.

(Voices: 'No objection'.)

2nd August 1932] [The President]

"No objection being taken, I shall put the main motion to the vote of the House.

"The motion is

'*that the Report of the Orissa Committee be taken into consideration*'."

The motion was carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"We have got on the agenda two amendments—one given notice of by the Raja of Bobbili and the other by Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. The first portion of the amendment of Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar covers the same ground as the amendment given notice of by the Raja of Bobbili, but the latter is a more comprehensive one. So I would call upon the Raja of Bobbili to move his amendment and later on would allow Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar to move the second portion of his amendment. The House will vote upon the amendments separately."

* The RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"Sir, with your permission, I move the following amendment:—

'*Add* the following at the end:—

"*and on such consideration this Council strongly opposes and emphatically protests against the recommendations of the Orissa Committee in so far as it favours the transfer of any portion of the Vizagapatam district and of any portion of the Ganjam district south of the Rushikulya river, its tributary, Godahado river and the Mohini hills and the transfer of any areas in which aboriginal tribes are in the majority, and this Council is further of opinion that this province should not be called upon to pay any subsidy either directly or indirectly on account of the transfer of any area from this province to the new Oriya province and urges upon this Government to convey this opinion to the Government of India with their own recommendation to the same effect*".'

"While doing so, I wish to make it quite clear that we do not stand in the way of the legitimate aspirations of the Oriyas for the formation of a province for them who are bound by common ties. I certainly sympathize with those aspirations of the Oriyas. I think the important grounds on which the separation of the province is urged are (1) to bring together the Oriyas who are now scattered in the various provinces, and (2) to eliminate the minorities problem. My primary objection to the report is that, by seeking to eliminate the minorities problem, you are creating a new minority problem in the case of the Andhras. It may be said in reply that adequate safeguards will be devised, and that there would be special representation, etc. But I am afraid, these are after all of doubtful utility. Those, Andhras, living in Vizagapatam and Ganjam districts—and who are going to become a minority—strongly object to the separation from the rest of the Andhras with whom they have been associated for many centuries.

[The Raja of Bobbili] [2nd August 1932

" Apart from the claims of the Andhras in these areas, I wish to place before this House the case of the aboriginal tribes who are almost voiceless and unable to effectively place their case before the public. Of course, it is a well-known fact that these people mostly inhabit the backward tracts known as the Agency and I think the Madras Government is spending three to four times the revenue derived, on this area. The test which the Report applies is one of race. I believe the Committee have erred when they said that there is racial affinity between the aboriginal tribes of Jeypore and the Oriyas in the Orissa province. I believe that the aboriginal tribes in Jeypore migrated to that part of the country really from the Central Provinces. It cannot be said that, simply because they speak the Oriya language, they are Oriyas by race.

3-45 p.m. " In deciding whether an area predominantly inhabited by the aboriginal tribes should be transferred or retained, I wish to impress on hon. Members of this House that they should first consider the interests of the tribes themselves, and not the interests of either the Andhras or the Oriyas. When you find what the Madras Government has been able to do to develop the Agency tracts, to provide facilities for the improvement of the economic condition of these aborigines, you are really unable to concede even a single point in favour of the transfer of these areas to a province, which even according to the Report itself is not likely to be self-supporting. My personal opinion however is that the figures mentioned in the Report about the establishment of the Secretariat will not be sufficient for carrying on the management of the new province; and I am sure it will be ultimately found necessary to increase the establishment; and in that way, the deficit will be much more than 45 lakhs. The question is: are we now going to transfer these tracts to the new province and thus deprive them of all the benefits and advantages that they now enjoy?

" Another difficulty that I foresee is the risk of providing Police facilities. We are not having sufficient Police force in these parts; a force is at present maintained at Vizagapatam. In times of trouble, it is very easy to convey the Police force to these areas. If the Jeypore zamindari is transferred to the new province, the Government of that province would be compelled to maintain a large force in a very unhealthy locality like Koraput and it will be really out of touch with the Inspector-General of Police. That is one reason. I have already stated that the proposal recommended will not be in the interests of the aboriginal tribes.

" As regards Parlakimedi, I feel that the very reasons given in the Report show that Parlakimedi does not fulfil any of the conditions laid down for its inclusion in the new province and separation from Madras. I need not therefore pursue that matter further.

" As regards the other areas, I do not see any justification for transferring those areas against the will of the population. I have

stated in my amendment that 'all areas north of the Rushikulya river' alone should be included in the new province. The rest of the district should remain with Madras.

"Sir, I have not very much more to say. I only wish to stress this point: that by creating this new province and including the Agency therein, a claim might be made later on, on the finances of Madras; simply because Madras has been spending more than Rs. 30 lakhs on these areas over and above the income derived from them, it might be said that Madras should contribute that amount towards the finances of the new province, to cover up the deficit. The purpose of my amendment is to make that point quite clear, that no such claim should be made on this province.

"With these words, Sir, I wish to recommend to the House my amendment."

The KUMARA RAJA OF VENKATAGIRI seconded the motion.

* Mr. K. P. RAMAN MENON:—"May I ask the hon. Member who moved the amendment to split it into three portions? If that is done, we can easily follow his argument with reference to the last portion of his argument at least. For example, I completely sympathize with the hon. Member when he says that this Presidency should not be called upon to subsidize the new province when it comes into being. But before I speak further on the other matters referred to in the amendment, such as racial distribution, the affinity of the aboriginal tribes, etc., I wish to know if the hon. Member would split his motion into three portions. The proposition naturally divides itself into three parts. First of all, there is the dismemberment. If I may so call it—of the Ganjam and Vizagapatam districts. Then comes the question of the aboriginal tribes—whether they are to be relegated to the new province or to be retained in the Madras province itself. I do not know how they are to be distributed between the two provinces. Thirdly, Sir, comes the subsidy question on which perhaps almost every one is agreed that we shall not be called upon to contribute anything to the new province. May I therefore call upon the proposer of the amendment to split it into three parts, so that it may be easier for us to follow the debate and to make up our minds with reference to each part of the proposition moved by him?"

* The RAJA OF KALLIKOTE:—"Mr. President, Sir, I rise to oppose the motion moved by my hon. Friend, the Raja Sahib of Bobbili. While thanking the Opposition for the little support they have given us, the result of the modest proposal made by us that this question be deferred until the next meeting of the Council clearly shows how helpless a minority the Oriyas are, not only in this Council, but in this province. I am afraid a debate on any motion regarding this subject is bound to be one-sided in this House. Including the hon. Member that is absent, there are three Oriyas in this House in a total strength of 132 and, Sir, you can well imagine what support the matter will receive. It is most unfortunate that this debate should have been

[The Raja of Kallikote] [2nd August 1932

introduced in this House. The Oriyas would welcome a debate in the Legislative Assembly and the Council of State and an impartial decision by the Government of India. It is a well-known fact that this Government is against the proposal of any portion of Ganjam going into the Oriya province and I dare say the claims of Oriyas before the House will receive the same fate. I, for one, will not press for a division, as I am confident that the quicker this Council disposes of this question, the stronger will be the case of the Oriyas before the Central Government and the other authorities.

4 p.m. "Mr. President, the Oriyas are in the unfortunate position of being in a helpless minority in four provinces now and there is no salvation for the community until it is brought under one administration. This agitation for the unification of the Oriya-speaking tracts under one province is more than 40 years' old and in spite of severe attacks it still exists and will exist until the problem is solved. Although I know the difficulties the Oriyas are suffering in the other provinces, I do not wish to describe them here, but only wish to describe a few grievances the Oriyas of this Presidency have. To begin with, we are in a helpless minority in this Council and, as Oriyas, we can achieve nothing. The Oriyas are not adequately represented in the Public Services and the little protection we had from the Government has completely disappeared after the constitution of the Public Services Commission. By way of illustration I might quote how even ordinary clerical posts in purely Oriya tracts of the Ganjam district are being filled up by persons from Trichinopoly and Tanjore when there are hundreds of qualified Oriyas in the district starving and unemployed. There are not enough educational facilities for the community and Madras University is about 700 miles away and it is not giving any instructions in Oriya. I have personal experience of this as a student of the Madras University and the Andhra University, although not so far, does not make adequate provision for the teaching of Oriya. Oriya culture and literature is losing its identity and the Oriya students are compelled to go to Cuttack and other places in the Bihar and Orissa province where better attention is paid to the teaching of Oriya; but unfortunately after they come back fully qualified the rules of the Madras Government do not give them a chance to secure any competitive posts. The result is they are discontented and are greatly adding to the list of unemployment in the Ganjam district. We have to come 700 miles to the Madras High Court for litigation whereas we will be within about hundred miles if the proposed province is given as it is intended to continue the same system of circuit judges visiting Cuttack to do the High Court work. There is no doubt that there is a genuine desire on the part of the educated Oriyas to be included in a separate province of Orissa and this desire is inspired not only through the difficulties that I have just described but through ties of history, language, race and relationship, that exist between the Oriyas of Ganjam and Oriyas of existing Orissa.

"I am sorry that there has been all this excitement on the part of the Andhras regarding the proposed Oriya Province. On the other

2nd August 1932] [The Raja of Kallikote]

hand the proposed province will give a stimulus to the Andhras to carry on their own agitation for a Andhra Province and whether a few miles of territory should be included in the Oriya Province or not should not worry them so much when once they concede to the principle that there should be a redistribution of provinces on linguistic and racial basis. A statement has been made quite recently that Berhampur owes all its culture, learning and civilization to the Telugus; but the fact that there is a college there presented by my late lamented father is carefully and conveniently forgotten. Without this college there would not have been the culture and learning which the Andhras profess they have endowed Berhampur with. The Telugus of Berhampur and Chatrapur are not residents of the land, but have migrated there from the southern districts in search of Government employment and other professions. I know of several families who have come from the south, especially from the Vizagapatam district and settled down in Berhampur and several places of the Ganjam district where luck has favoured them due to the fact that the Oriyas were not educated and were very backward at that time. I have travelled quite enough in the Ganjam Agency and I have noticed at several places that I visited that Oriya is the second language used by these aborigines. It is unfortunate that the report of the Orissa Committee while recommending the inclusion of Parlakimedi Estate and the Jeypore Agency is excluding a strip of the coast including the Estates of Mandasa, Tekkali and Tarla. These estates have as strong a claim to be included in the Oriya Province as the Parlakimedi Estate has. Whatever may be the difference of opinion regarding the boundary, we cannot deny the fact that we have to face actual realities and that is the huge deficit that has been pointed out in the Report. As far as the Ganjam district is concerned, I am definitely against any further taxation and I cannot see what further new source of revenue can be tapped. We have to investigate thoroughly the conditions prevailing in the other parts that are recommended to be included in the new province and see how far taxation on new sources is possible. The expenditure has also to be further examined to see if it can be curtailed further. All this, I submit, can be done effectively by appointing a committee of officials and non-officials from the area that is proposed to be included in the new province to see how far further resources can be tapped and how far expenditure can be reduced. If this is not possible the only other alternative is for the Government of India to come forward with a subvention and thereby satisfy about ten millions of the Oriya population whose grievances are genuine and old. In spite of the opposition that this proposal may receive in this Council if the Oriyas are fortunate enough to get their province I wish to assure you, Sir, that it will be an ideal homogeneous little province where there will be no Brahman and non-Brahman feeling, no Hindu and Moslem differences, and communal troubles, from which other provinces have been suffering. The proposed province will cause no administrative inconvenience to the Madras Government. On the other hand, the separation would save

this Government a sum of rupees seventeen and odd lakhs. As a measure of retrenchment this should appeal to the hon. the Finance Member. If I was still a member of the Retrenchment Committee, I would press this aspect of the question before the hon. the Finance Member.

"With these few words, Mr. President, I wish to endorse the Majority Report of the Orissa Committee and to add that the Estates of Mandasa, Tekkali and Tarla should be included in the proposed province."

* Mr. C. SATYANARAYANA CHOUDARI:—"Mr. President, Sir, with great pleasure, I rise to support the motion so ably made by the Raja Sahib of Bobbili. The Report before this House consists of two parts; one part dealing with the question of the formation of a separate province for the Oriya-speaking tracts and the other part dealing with the question of the particular areas which ought to be included in the proposed province. Both the recommendations made by the Committee in this report are disappointing and discouraging. The question of the formation of a new province for a particular area or for a particular people is always inseparably bound up with the question of finance. When we deal with the question of the formation of a new province, the first and foremost thing that we ought to consider is the financial implications involved in the proposal! What does the proposed new province cost? What does the administration of the province cost? What are the revenues of the province? What is the expenditure that is likely to be incurred for the administration of the new province? Is there going to be a deficit, and if there should be a deficit, are the people of the new province prepared to tax themselves or make up the deficit somehow or other? These are the points that ought to be borne in mind in dealing with a question of this kind. In fact, that is the principle laid down by the Sub-Committee of the Round Table Conference which was appointed to consider the question of the formation of a new province for Sind. Now, applying this test, where do we stand? If we look into the Report, I should say, that the Report stands self-condemned in this matter. The Report states that the province which it proposes to form has to start with a deficit of 35 lakhs in the first year and in the course of 15 years, the deficit will grow to 41 lakhs. And, how is this deficit to be made good. That is a question that ought to be pertinently raised. This question was answered by the Raja Sahib of Parlakimedi. I am sorry to find he is not here to-day. The answer that he gave before the Round Table Conference was that the people are prepared to tax themselves. That is the reply, Sir, which the Raja Sahib made before the Round Table Conference at a time when he had no idea of what the deficit was going to be. Now, if this deficit is to be made good at all, it can be made good only by an enhancement of taxes by 30 per cent. I ask, Sir, are the people prepared to tax themselves by 30 per cent more. The Raja Sahib has given an undertaking on behalf of the people that they are prepared to do that. When I read his reply, I was reminded of the man of the Tamil proverb who goes along a street, sees a Pillayar koil and a coconut shop, lays his hands

2nd August 1932] [Mr. C Satyanarayana Choudari]

upon the coconut in the shop, breaks it in order to satisfy the deity and goes away without paying the owner of the coconut. The Raja Sahib has nothing to lose by the undertaking that he has given. Is he authorized or is he competent to speak on behalf of the people? As we know, the people of the areas which are sought to be included in the new province are already poorer than the people of the other parts of the Presidency. Thirty per cent enhancement in the taxes is bad enough, nay, may I say it is frightful even for a normally well-off province; it would be oppressive—Sir, nay, unbearable—in the case of the people on whose behalf the Raja Sahib spoke before the Round Table Conference.

" Well, Sir, the other remedy suggested by the report to get over this question of financial difficulty is that the Government of India might be asked to contribute out of the Central or Federal revenues. Here again, the Committee has gone wrong. It is a well-known fact that the Government of India has made it very clear that under no circumstances, would they accept any liability on the Central revenues. The Government of India, as it is, has to contribute about a crore of rupees to maintain the new North-West Frontier Province and if a separate province should be formed for Sind, another half a crore of rupees will have to be contributed out of the Federal or Central revenues. Wherefrom, then, will the Government of India be expected to get these 30 or 40 lakhs which the Oriya province may require to make good the deficit?

" Then, Sir, assuming that the Government of India is going to agree to the proposal to contribute 30 or 40 lakhs every year, yet the Government of India is not going to be a free agency in the matter under the new constitution, as we expect to have provincial autonomy for every province, when the provinces will have as much independence as possible and the voices of the provinces will have to be taken into consideration. The various provinces may complain or may resist the claim for contribution and justly too, because there is absolutely no justification why the general tax-payer ought to be expected to pay just to satisfy the sentiments of the Oriyas in their anxiety to have a separate province. If we look into Percy Report, i.e., the Federal Finance Committee, we see that under the new constitution six out of eight provinces will have to face staggering deficits year after year.

" Sir, having indicated the financial difficulties implied in the recommendation of the Committee for the formation of a separate province, I must at once say, at the same time, that I am not opposed to the principle of forming provinces on a linguistic basis. In fact, Sir, there is no responsible Andhra who is opposed to the principle underlying the demand of the Oriyas for a province for themselves. If my Oriya friends want to have a province for them and if they think that they can meet the expenditure involved in having a new province for themselves without the financial difficulties coming in the way, by all means, let them have it; I will be the first man to bless them and wish them every success.

[Mr. C. Satyanarayana Choudari] [2nd August 1932

"Having indicated the financial difficulties so far as the formation of a new province is concerned, I will go to the second part of the report which deals with the question of the areas that have got to be included in the proposed new province. With the exception of one or two small tracts, the report recommends the inclusion of the whole of the Vizagapatam Agency tracts. Sir, this is a recommendation which is opposed to the view of the Government of Madras. The Government of Madras has had occasion to express its attitude on this matter on more than one occasion between now and 1902.

4-15 p.m. "Time and again the Government of Madras have made it clear that the Agency tract cannot be transferred to the new province. In fact, the sub-committee appointed by the Statutory Commission which is popularly known as the Simon Commission, has also made a similar recommendation, namely, that the Vizagapatam Agency tract cannot, under any circumstances, be transferred to the new province. I think there are valid reasons to support this recommendation. The Agency tract consists not only of Oriyas, not only of Telugus; there are wild tracts inhabited by aboriginal tribes like the Khonds, Savaras and Koyas. These are tribes who are very much uncivilized, who require to be reclaimed, which means money. The Government of Madras have been very charitable towards these tribes. They have been spending year after year several lakhs to improve their civilization and their material condition. Now to assign these tribes, or rather, to send them along with the Oriyas, when the Oriyas are going to start with a deficit budget in the first year is really cruel.

"Apart from the question of aboriginal tribes residing in the Agency tracts, what is the condition of the Oriyas themselves? The Oriyas residing in the Vizagapatam Agency tracts are far less civilized and far less advanced than their Oriya brethren in the Orissa province. Even these require special consideration at the hands of the Government. Under the new province the Oriyas residing in this area cannot be expected to receive the same attention which they are having at the hands of the Government of Madras all along.

"Now, Sir, there is another reason why the Vizagapatam Agency tract should not be transferred to the new province. There is the Godavari Delta system, which is mainly dependent upon the forests for the rains which give us the full supply of water for our irrigation channels. If that tract is to be taken away by the new province then the forests situated in those tracts will also go away into their hands, and there is the danger of the delta system being affected, which in its turn might ultimately affect the rest of the country.

"Now, Sir, there is the question of the transfer of certain portions of the Ganjam district. The whole Committee is unanimous in recommending certain portions to be transferred to the new province.

"On the question of Parlakimedi estate there is a difference of opinion between the President and the other members of the Committee.

2nd August 1932] [Mr. C. Satyanarayana Choudari]

The same arguments which I have adduced with reference to the Vizagapatam Agency tract would apply with equal force so far as the aboriginal tribes residing in these areas are concerned.

"The reasons given with reference to the inclusion of Berhampur taluk and Parlakimedi taluk will have to be specially considered. In the case of the Berhampur taluk there is the Berhampur town. As hon. Members of this House are aware Berhampur town is mostly populated by Telugus. It is more a Telugu town than an Oriya town. Forty-eight per cent of the people of the town are Telugus. The town is built up by the enterprise of the Telugus. The Telugu inhabitants of the town have vested interests in the town. Is it fair that such a town should be transferred to the new province?

"Then with regard to the Parlakimedi estate, the case made out by the other members of the Committee is unconvincing. The President has stated that the argument that the Telugu people of Parlakimedi estate are in favour of going into the new province is unreal. He is quite right when he said that he cannot simply believe this. The Committee has set before itself certain tests which ought to be satisfied before certain tracts can be assigned to the new province. Two of these tests are the race test and the language test. If we apply the race test, we find that 53 per cent of the people living in Parlakimedi estate are Telugus and less than 24 per cent are Oriyas. If we apply the language test, then we find that 63 per cent of the population are Telugus and less than 21 per cent are Oriyas. Where then, Sir, is the case for the transfer of Parlakimedi estate made out? Finally there is one general and most important argument which I would submit in support of the motion made by the hon. the Raja Sahib of Bobbili, namely, the desirability of avoiding, as far as possible, the minorities question in the new province; I would say, Sir, that the minorities question is a question which is troubling every country wherever it exists. That is a problem which ought to be avoided as far as possible.

"Let me make my position quite clear. I am not for opposing the demand of the Oriyas if it is financially a practicable proposition. The principle to be adopted in the formation of a new province is the principle of including only such tracts where the Oriyas are predominantly large in numbers. If this test is to be followed then Parlakimedi estate ought to be excluded, and a portion of Berhampur taluk also, including Berhampur town will have to be excluded. Wherever you find non-Oriyas residing in large numbers, exclude them in forming the new province and include only those tracts where Oriyas are predominating in numbers; then we shall have no quarrel with the Government. If, on the other hand, Government should accept the recommendations of the Committee wholesale, then I am afraid Government will be courting trouble on its head. We know what it is to partition a country against the wishes of a large section of the public. We know what it was in Bengal when it was divided. If it is the intention of Government to accept the recommendations of the Committee wholesale then we shall not be wrong if we interpret their attitude as an attempt to dismember the Andhra country. That is a matter which Government would do

[Mr. C. Satyanarayana Choudari] [2nd August 1932

well to consider very carefully before they take any definite action in the matter. The feeling in the country in this matter is very strong and intense. At a meeting presided over by Sir Kurma Reddi, the other day at Bezwada, which was attended by people from all parts of the Andhra country—it was a full meeting—this question was freely and fully discussed and the unanimous opinion of the meeting was that the recommendations of the Committee ought to be modified on the lines suggested by me, namely, to exclude the tracts where the Telugus are predominantly large in numbers from the new province. It does not matter if there is a small number of Andhras in the tracts proposed to be added to the new province. If there is any tract which is sought to be added in the new province where the number of Telugus is larger than the number of Oriyas then the feeling in the country against inclusion is so strong that Government cannot afford to ignore it without really complicating the position in the country which is already bad. I, therefore, support the motion of the hon. Member from Vizagapatam."

* Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro:—" Mr. President, Sir, we are, in this Council, four representatives from the Ganjam district constituency, one of whom represents the special constituency of landholders (Oriya and Telugu) and two of whom are Oriyas, represent the general constituency and myself a Telugu, who has been associated with Oriya zamindars for generations and have the honour of being one of the originators of the movement of Utkal union, to bring together all the Oriya-speaking people under one administration for the promotion of culture, race, language and material advancement of the Oriyas. I supported the plea of a separate province at the Round Table Conference. It is a pity that the Raja of Parlakimedi is not able to be present here to-day, for by his able advocacy he may have thrown light on the arguments in support of the area he is interested in.

" There has been agitation for a separate province since 1901 and many reports and despatches of this Government are now available to Government to formulate a consistent policy on the lines of predominance of language or race in any area to be excluded, though other factors may also play not an insignificant part in the final shaping of the decision relating to such parts of the province as might come within the new province. I agree with the Raja of Khallikote that the report under consideration does not contain all the necessary materials, but to those who reside in the area, the facts are quite familiar.

" Personally, I am in an independent position and am quite disinterested as I hold properties both in the northern and southern parts of the district and do not think that there should be any bitter controversy in the matter. The differences are, in my view, capable of being adjusted amicably by proper understanding.

" As at present understood until there is a change in the programme and procedure, this subject is placed on the agenda of the Consultative Committee. The despatches of the Governments of Madras and of India will also be available for making definite recommendations to His Majesty's Government. As a member of that body, I do not desire to prejudge the issue raised in the debate before the House."

2nd August 1932] [Mr. P. C. Moses]

* Mr. P. C. Moses:—" Mr. President, Sir, as a member representing Indian Christians of the northern districts, I desire very much to express my views on the question under discussion. In framing their proposals the Orissa Committee took account of language, subsidiary language, the race and the wishes of the people. They also attached primary importance to the wishes of the inhabitants of the tract proposed to become part of the new province, and they proceeded on the principle that only very exceptional circumstances could justify the transfer of an area against the wishes of its inhabitants. Sir, in paragraph 65 on page 26 of the report the concluding sentence reads thus:—

> 'It is unfortunate that this area includes a Telugu fringe; but the narrow coastal belt in which they predominate cannot be detached from the interior, and the wishes of a small minority cannot be the determining factor.'

" Here is an instance of the reversal of the principles which the members of the Committee have taken into consideration in determining the boundaries. Two facts are evident from this statement, that the Telugus predominate in large numbers and they intensely desire to be left where they have been. To my mind there is no force in the objection that the narrow strip of land could not be detached. No arguments have been advanced why this small belt should not be detached from the interior. Perhaps they are not insuperable; not even serious difficulties. I therefore plead that this narrow coastal belt should be retained in the Madras province. Then again, Sir, I strongly support the opinion of the Chairman on the subject of the inclusion of the Zamindari of Parlakimedi. The other two members of the Committee in framing their recommendation for the transfer of the area argued that the Telugu tenants are happy and contented and that they desire to go along with the zamindar to the new province.

" One would naturally expect that the Telugus would be opposed to such a transfer; a transfer, which would involve separation from a rich province to a poor province, a transfer which would involve separation from the Andhra University which provides special educational facilities for the Telugus. Under these circumstances the Telugus should advance stronger reasons than those mentioned in the report so that they may not argue differently if there is to be a change in the policy of administration. In paragraph 71 the Committee make mention of the places which should be transferred to the new province of Orissa. Going through the statistics I find there is one feature not taken into consideration by the Committee with regard to some areas of the Vizagapatam Agency which are proposed to be transferred to the Oriya province. The population classified in the report as 'neither' preponderates over the Telugus and Oriyas put together. The principal consideration in determining the boundaries is the wishes of the people. If the principal consideration is the wishes of the people, and if they are not in a position to give their opinion, the Legislative Council and the Government should decide for them. What is good for them should be done for them. It is for His Majesty's Government to decide finally for them whether it is beneficial for them to be transferred to the deficit province

4-30 p.m.

or to remain in the Madras Province. I am definitely for the formation of the Orissa Province. By all means the desire of the Oriyas which in my opinion is quite legitimate should be met with but the province should be formed with such exceptions as I pointed out in the course of my speech."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti :—" Mr. President, Sir, I should think that the Council should feel immensely grateful to the hon. the Revenue Member for bringing up this subject before this Legislative Council to elicit its opinion with regard to the Report of the Orissa Commission. As you are aware, Sir, our rules and regulations consist of so many checks and counter-checks that the hon. the Revenue Member might easily have tabooed the discussion on this subject on the ground that it is not primarily the concern of the Local Government or that the discussion of this subject might embarrass the proposals of the Government of India to the Home Government, I should think that if the analogy that the Government followed in respect of the other motion is followed here the motion should have also been tabooed by the hon. the Revenue Member and we should have been denied the privilege of discussing this subject. He does not know why those gentlemen who are in favour of consulting this report should ask for an adjournment on the ground, at any rate, on the stated ground that they were not prepared with the material to proceed with the discussion on this subject. Apart from one or two persons whose contention that they did not study the subject-matter of this discussion being correct and true, I do not think, Sir, it would be possible for us to believe that those gentlemen who have taken a prominent part in the discussion of this subject would have considered the non-study of the material as proper ground for adjourning this question. As a matter of fact the speech made by the Raja of Khallikhote let the cat out of the bag. He did not want a discussion from this Council for the reason that they are in a hopeless minority. He never expected the decision to be in his favour. He, therefore, wanted to resort to the devise of adjournment so that he may try his hand with the Government of India. When he thinks that the Government of India might come to his support, he is reckoning without the host. The Government of India have already expressed their opinion on the general question of formation of provinces that the whole question is one. In fact this question of the formation of provinces on linguistic provinces was started by the Andhras. There might be many reasons for supporting that agitation. (Interruptions.) Well, I have no objection for yielding the palm to the Oriyas for supporting the agitation for the formation of provinces on linguistic basis. I dare say the chief impetus for the formation of province on linguistic basis is because that sections of population feel that their interests are neglected in the conglomeration of many other races and languages. So that each one community wanted separate administration as their interests might receive better attention at the hands of the Government. Whether their interests consisted in the improvement of land, or whether their interests consisted in the improvement of the trade and commerce or whether their interests consisted in

2nd August 1932] [Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti]

fighting for jobs in Government it is immaterial. People did really want that their interests should be carefully attended to by the administration to which they could have easy access. Big communities representing particular language or race should form a geographical unit for the purpose of administration is a very legitimate aspiration. I am one of those who believe that probably better improvement would result by the formation of provinces of that sort. But that proposition must always be secondary to that of finance. But if the province is to face deficits it will not be proper for the mere satisfaction of sentiment to have a linguistic province and face the deficit year after year. Nor would it be a proper proposition even if the Government of India are in a mood to give subventions year after year for each province. I do not think, Sir, that the Government of India, if ever it did, is now in a position to give subsidies to any province. Having regard to that fact which it is impossible to counteract it seems to me that the formation of provinces on linguistic basis whether it be for Oriyas or Andhras is a transfer which is not in the immediate prospect of fructification. It is very likely that the whole question might end with academic discussion. But the Government of India and the Home Government should know the feelings of these people from whom it is sought to take a considerable portion of territory. Now it is also conceded not only by the Government of India but also by the Secretary of State for India in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report that in the matter of division of provinces every care should be taken that no new causes of animosities, irritation or bickerings are given rise to in order to allay the existing ones. If that test is applied this Commission while recognizing that to be the test by which the provinces should be redistributed does not seem to have given their due weight in their recommendations. Large tracts of land which are inhabited by predominantly Telugu population are sought to be taken away and added on to the Orissa Province. I do not think the Oriyas themselves would feel quite comfortable with a strong minority in the province. Even as they say that their feelings, their interests are neglected, that they are not properly represented, that they can never stand to improve in a province where other races or other communities representing other languages predominate, the Telugu minority will feel. The Raja of Khallikhote has made a very important contention in favour of forming the Orissa Province, viz., that their interests are neglected. Same questions may arise in the minds of the Telugus when these tracts are transferred. Would the Raja of Khallikhote be willing to give to the Telugus of Gumsur, Berhampur and Parlakimedi more than two or three seats in the Oriya Province. (The Raja of Khallikhote: Four seats.) You are no better now. You are four here. One gentleman does not want to prejudge the issue though he had many occasions to judge and dictate. Another gentleman who has estates in particular parts does not want those parts to be taken away for the new province. The third gentleman supports because he stands to gain. Sir, therefore, this problem will arise with all minorities and the only solution for avoiding such bickerings will be to allow these minorities to go to a place where they want to remain. I do not think there is any doubt on this point.

[Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti] [2nd August 1932

They do not want to be adopted to the new province. They want to be left alone. The Raja of Bobbili has laid down a line of demarcation excluding the Telugu tracts. Except in one or two places neither the Oriyas nor the Telugus are in a majority. There seems to be a neutral population which does not come either as Oriyas or Telugus. That is no reason why their vote should be in favour of Oriyas. It might as well be in favour of Telugus. There is one fact which appeals to me why those tracts should be in the Madras Province. I do not think that Madras is either thoroughly Telugu or Tamil. So I have no bias for Tamils or Telugus inasmuch as I want this to be with the Madras Presidency. The Madras Presidency is in a position to expend the monies for the improvement of those tracts and for the betterment of that population whereas the Oriyas will be in a great handicap when these questions of reclaiming these people arise. Sir, so far as the Government of Madras is concerned I am glad to find that they agree with the point of view put forward by the Telugus of these tracts. As a matter of fact in 1926 in their despatch to the Government of India in answer to a reference from the Government of Bengal they made the following observations:—

'It is shown there that the transfer would give rise to serious difficulties in connexion with the linguistic and racial conditions and the geographical conformation of the tract in question, that it would greatly complicate and confuse its judicial arrangements, and that it would place the administration of its peculiar land revenue system in the languages of officers who would have no acquaintance with the principles on which it is based or with the language in which the bulk of its records are and must continue to be maintained.'

"This despatch was made by the Government of Madras in consultation with the Ministry which then consisted of my hon. Friend Sir Patro who would not like to judge the issue at present. I, therefore, Sir, have great pleasure in supporting the motion made by the Raja of Bobbili."

4-45 p.m. * Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo:—"Mr. President, Sir, now the question before the House is whether certain areas proposed to be transferred to the new province to be created should be transferred or not from the Madras Presidency. The hon. the Raja of Bobbili moved an amendment that the area north of the Rushikulya river and also north of the Ghodahado river may be taken into the new province and the rest not. Well, some hon. Members called upon him to state what those areas are and what his reasons are for saying that the areas south of that line should not go into the new province. Unfortunately, he has not been able to give his reasons, or at all events he has not tried to elucidate his position till now. As he has got the Report of the Committee, which he seems to have studied well, he ought to have spoken in terms of the language of the Report. That is to say the Report refers to the various taluks in the district. Well, I think for the clear understanding by the several hon. Members of this House, he ought to have taken that course if he cared to convince the Members of this House. But he is sure of carrying this motion with the help of Government. Anyhow, this motion, it seems, is also brought forward

2nd August 1932] [Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo]

to strengthen the hands of the Government. The result is well assured in his favour, and therefore he did not care to make the proposition clear. He clubbed in one motion several matters which ought to have been split up as was pointed out by the hon. Member from Malabar. So far as I could understand that proposition, I should say if a line is drawn as proposed by the Raja Sahib of Bobbili, I think the Kodala taluk will go to the new province as well as a portion of the Chatrapur taluk and the whole of the Gumsur division. He tried to exclude the zamindaris of Bodokimidi, Zarada, Chikati and Surangi. I cannot understand how he can claim these areas to be retained in the Madras Presidency. What are the tests to be applied? Apply any test you like, and you will find that these areas cannot be retained. So far as the Berhampur town is concerned, the Oriya and the Andhra population is equal. As stated by the Census Superintendent of the Madras Presidency, the tendency for foreigners is to congregate in towns. That is the reason why you find in all towns a preponderating group of people speaking the Telugu language. Though Berhampur taluk is not decidedly so, Berhampur town is an instance in point. Even in Aska you find the Telugu population preponderating, even in Russelkonda or in Chatrapur, which is only an official colony. At a time when the Oriyas were uneducated and when the Oriyas were compelled to read in schools where only Telugu was taught and when the Oriya language was not the court language, people from the south went there as officials and settled down in those towns. That is the reason why you find in those towns a preponderance of the Telugu population. On that ground you cannot claim that the whole of the Berhampur taluk should be retained in the Madras Presidency. Thus you find that the hon. Mover has not given satisfactory reasons at all for retaining them in the Madras Presidency. He generally said that in those tracts the Telugus preponderate. Let him show by facts and figures the grounds on which he takes his stand. Did he refer to any census figures? Did he refer to the report of the Orissa Committee where the figures are given both by race and by mother tongue? He has utterly failed to maintain his position and I believe he really does not know what areas are included in his own proposition. As he said, as a representative of the Vizagapatam district he had to move this motion. Naturally of course, we know that the Vizagapatam city will be much affected if Jeypur is transferred. Jeypur, so to speak, is an appendage of the Vizagapatam bar. If Jeypur is transferred, the Vizagapatam people will be affected and that is the reason why he fights against the transfer of Jeypur though the Committee state that there is no case made out at all against the transfer so far as the Vizagapatam Agency was concerned. While that is what they clearly stated, what is the evidence let in and what are the arguments put forward by the Andhras so far as the Jeypur Agency is concerned? (Sir A. P. Patro: The ancient boundary of Kalinga.) Of course, I shall come to Kalinga later on.

"Now, as the hon. the Revenue Member pointed out, we have to consider the question from certain standpoints. First of all, it should be considered historically. I shall just read a passage from the famous

[Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo] [2nd August 1932

Firmingher's Fifth Report. In Volume III of the well-known Firmingher's Fifth Report on East India Affairs (1 & 2) at page 79, the Oriyas are described as the natives of the soil. In dealing with the Raj family of Vizianagram in the Vizagapatam district in Volume III of the report it is stated as follows:—

'In general the history of all the Ranzees, or tribe of Raohewar in the circars, trace their origin to a dependence on the ancient rajas of the country either as Chelaks or favoured slaves, managers, talukdars or renters of the sub-divisions of the sovereign domain; and such also was the rise of all the other petty holders of land existing in this province, whether descended from the Velmawars of Telinga, or natives of the soil itself properly called Oriya.'

"In dealing with the population of the Northern Circars, Mr. James Grant in his political survey of the Northern Circars reproduced in Volume III of the Fifth Report says:—

'They (the native inhabitants of Northern Circars) are parts of the two nations of Telinga and Oriya, *Woria* or Orissa formerly divided from each other by the Godavari, but since their union under the Government a good deal mixed among themselves, as well as with some of the neighbouring tribes.'

"Therefore, you can clearly see the real boundary between the Telanga country and the Orissa country was the river Godavari. After the downfall of the Orissa kingdom, the northern portion was taken over by the Mahrattas and the southern portion by the Nizam. When the Nizam ruled this part of the country, the Telugus who predominated in the Nizam's Dominion entered this part of the country. So, you will find most of the zamindars you find in the Godavari and in the other districts of the Circars trace their origin from the officials or the farmers of revenue under the Nawab and all these people came from the south or from the Nizam's Dominions. Therefore, it can be easily seen that this part also was part of the Orissa country. Ultimately Oriyas had to seek shelter in the wild tracts of the country when the Orissa kingdom fell and the Oriyas were defeated on this side and also on the other side. It is also stated in the report itself that most of the zamindars were in the Ganjam district where they were appointed as Lords of the Marshes by the King of Puri. The report accepts that theory. It is also stated in the report that the Oriyas held sway even beyond the Kistna river. So, it is clear that it is only in the sixteenth or seventeenth century that the Telugus came to occupy the tract even between the Ganjam district and the Godavari river. You find reference to an Orissa Governor on the banks of the Godavari in the life of Chaitanya, known as Roy Ramanand. The great Lord Gouranga met him on the banks of the Godavari. Now the place has been spotted and marked by a small temple built there. Therefore, there is no doubt that Oriyas held sway over this part of the country also."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Discussion on this motion will be continued on the next available day. Probably the next available day will be the 4th or the 5th instant which is to be fixed in consultation with His Excellency who is to allot non-official days.

"The Council will now adjourn and meet again to-morrow at 11 a.m."

X.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

1. [1]*Memorandum, dated the 21st March 1932, of the Revenue Department with reference to question No. 557, dated the 3rd November 1931.*

2. [2]*U.O. Note, dated the 11th April 1932, from the Public (Services) Department with reference to the supplementary answer to question No. 774, dated 28th January 1932.*

3. [3]*A report on the floods which occurred in the Ganjam, Vizagapatam and West Godavari districts in October and November 1931.*

4. [4]*G.O. No. 801, L. & M., dated 1st March 1932, approving the payment of tax at half-rates for third and fourth quarters of 1931–32 in respect of certain vehicles not using public roads.*

5. [5]*G.O. No. 945, L. & M., dated 12th March 1932, regarding the appointment of M.R.Ry. Rai Bahadur N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar Avargal, B.A., B.L., as member of the committee to enquire into the incidence of taxation on motor vehicles in the Madras Presidency.*

6. [6]*G.O. No. 201, Development, dated 15th February 1932, recording the audit report on the accounts of the Government Fisheries Cannery, Chaliyam, for the year ending 31st March 1931.*

7. [4]*Memorandum No. 14216-C, L. & M., dated 22nd April 1932, regarding the payment of tax at half-rates in respect of certain motor vehicles not using public roads.*

8. [7]*A report on the floods which occurred in the Tinnevelly, Trichinopoly, Tanjore and South Arcot districts in December 1931.*

9. [6]*G.O. No. 234, Development, dated 19th February 1932, recording the audit report on the accounts of the Government Industrial Institute, Madura, for the year ending 31st March 1931.*

10. [4]*G.O. No. 1114, L. & M., dated 23rd March 1932, fixing the date of retirement of members of local boards.*

11. [6]*G.O. No. 493, Development, dated 9th April 1932, recording the audit report on the accounts of the Chenat Nair Exploitation Division for the year 1930–31.*

12. [6]*Proceedings of the meetings of the Finance Committee held on the 8th and 17th March 1932.*

13. [8]*U.O. Note No. 10392-A-2, Public (General), dated the 19th May 1932, with reference to the answer given to question No. 1056 in the Legislative Council on the 24th March 1932.*

14. [9]*U.O. Note No. 4196-3, Public (General), dated 23rd May 1932, with reference to the answer given to clause (a) of question No. 1252 in the Legislative Council on the 24th March 1932.*

[1] Printed as Appendix VII on page 118 infra.
[2] Printed as Appendix VIII on page 119 infra.
[3] Printed as Appendix IX on pages 119—125 infra.
[4] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette.*
[5] Placed on Editors' Table.
[6] Printed separately.
[7] Printed as Appendix X on pages 125—131 infra.
[8] Printed as Appendix XI on pages 131–132 infra.
[9] Printed as Appendix XII on page 132 infra.

[2nd August 1932

15. [1] *U.O. Note No.* 8836-2, *Public (General), dated the* 23*rd May* 1932, *with reference to the answer given to question No.* 1103 *in the Legislative Council on the* 23*rd March* 1932.

16. [2] *U.O. Note No.* 10280-2, *Public (General), dated* 23*rd May* 1932, *with reference to the answer to clauses (c) and (d) of question No.* 1112 *given in the Legislative Council on* 24*th March* 1932.

17. [3] *U.O. Note No.* 10353-2, *Public (General), dated* 25*th May* 1932, *with reference to the answer given in the Legislative Council to question No.* 1057 *on the* 19*th March* 1932.

18. [4] *List of posts on Rs.* 500 *per mensem and above created during the quarter ending March* 1932.

19. [5] *G.O. No.* 589, *Development, dated* 28*th April* 1932, *recording the audit report on the accounts of the Forest Utilization Division, Madras, for the year ended* 31*st March* 1931.

20. [5] *G.O. No.* 602, *Development, dated* 30*th April* 1932, *recording the audit report on the accounts of the Mount Stuart Working Circle for the year ended* 31*st March* 1931.

21. [6] *G.O. No.* 1590, *L. & M., dated* 2*nd May* 1932, *exempting the motor lorry No. M.C./P.* 4124 *from the payment of the tax for third quarter of* 1931–32.

22. [7] *G.O. No.* 266, *Finance, dated* 4*th May* 1932, *regarding the constitution of the Public Accounts and Finance Committees,* 1932–33.

23. [8] *G.O. No.* 1884, *L. & M., dated* 23*rd May* 1932, *fixing the date of retirement of members of certain panchayats.*

24. [9] *G.O. No.* 1944, *L. & M., dated* 27*th May* 1932, *fixing the date of retirement of members of panchayats (ex-unions).*

25. [10] *G.O. No.* 2132, *L. & M., dated* 8*th June* 1932, *fixing the date of retirement of members of Manamadura panchayat (Ramnad district).*

26. [6] *G.O. No.* 2220, *L. & M., dated* 11*th June* 1932, *cancelling the rules issued in G.O. No.* 1645, *L. & M., dated* 15*th May* 1931, *regarding the production of licences on demand and institution of proceedings for the recovery of taxes.*

27. [11] *U.O. No.* 8832–3, *Public (General), dated* 30*th May* 1932, *with reference to the answer given to question No.* 1102 *in the Legislative Council on the* 23*rd March* 1932.

[1] Printed as Appendix XIII on page 133 infra.

[2] Printed as Appendix XIV on page 133 infra.

[3] Printed as Appendix XV on page 134 infra.

[4] Printed as Appendix XVI on pages 135–136 infra.

[5] Printed separately.

[6] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*.

[7] Printed as Appendix XVII on page 137 infra.

[8] Placed on Editor's Table.

[9] Printed as Appendix XVIII on page 138 infra.

[10] Printed as Appendix XIX on page 139 infra.

[11] Printed as Appendix XX on pages 139–140 infra.

2nd August 1932]

28. [1]*U.O. No.* 8835-1, *Public* (*General*), *dated* 30*th May* 1932, *with reference to the answer to question No.* 1075 *given in the Legislative Council on the* 21*st March* 1932.

29. [2]*U.O. No.* 10129-2, *Public* (*General*), *dated* 30*th May* 1932, *with reference to the answer to question No.* 1100 *given in the Legislative Council on the* 23*rd March* 1932.

30. [3]*U.O. No.* 10592-2, *Public* (*General*), *dated* 30*th May* 1932, *with reference to the answer to question No.* 1120 *given in the Legislative Council on the* 24*th March* 1932.

31. [4]*U.O. No.* 8835-2, *Public* (*General*), *dated* 31*st May* 1932, *with reference to the answer given to question No.* 1074 *in the Legislative Council on the* 21*st March* 1932.

32. [5]*U.O. No.* 8839-2, *Public* (*General*), *dated* 4*th June* 1932, *with reference to the answer to question No.* 1101 *answered in the Legislative Council on the* 23*rd March* 1932.

33. [6]*U.O. No.* 10136-2, *Public* (*General*), *dated* 4*th June* 1932, *with reference to the answer to question No.* 1176 *given in the Legislative Council on the* 24*th March* 1932.

34. [7]*U.O. Note No.* 10092-3, *Public* (*General*), *dated* 17*th June* 1932, *with reference to the answer given to question No.* 1121 *in the Legislative Council on the* 24*th March* 1932.

35. [8]*U.O. Note No.* 9462-2, *dated* 20*th June* 1932, *with reference to the answer to the supplementary question to question No.* 1237 *given in the Legislative Council on* 24*th March* 1932.

36. [9]*U.O. Note No.* 10783-2, *dated* 20*th June* 1932, *with reference to the answer to the Legislative Council question No.* 1259 *given on* 24*th March* 1932.

37. [10]*U.O. Note No.* 10818-2, *Public* (*General*), *dated* 20*th June* 1932, *with reference to the answer to question No.* 1258 *given on* 24*th March* 1932.

38. [11]*G.O. No.* 2482, *L. & M., dated* 27*th June* 1932, *fixing the date of retirement of members of certain panchayats* (*ex-unions*).

39. [12]*G.O. No.* 2500, *L. & M., dated* 27*th June* 1932, *fixing the date of retirement of members of district and taluk boards and panchayats* (*other than ex-unions*).

40. [13]*G.O. No.* 2484, *L. & M., dated* 27*th June* 1932, *notifying the exclusion of Mettur taluk from areas of the Salem and Coimbatore District Boards.*

[1] Printed as Appendix XXI on page 140 infra.

[2] Printed as Appendix XXII on pages 140–141 infra.

[3] Printed as Appendix XXIII on pages 141–142 infra.

[4] Printed as Appendix XXIV on page 142 infra.

[5] Printed as Appendix XXV on page 143 infra.

[6] Printed as Appendix XXVI on page 144 infra.

[7] Printed as Appendix XXVII on pages 144–145 infra.

[8] Printed as Appendix XXVIII on pages 145–146 infra.

[9] Printed as Appendix XXIX on pages 146–147 infra.

[10] Printed as Appendix XXX on page 147 infra.

[11] Printed as Appendix XXXI on page 148 infra.

[12] Printed as Appendix XXXII on page 149 infra.

[13] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*.

[2nd August 1932

41. [1]*G.O. No.* 2585, *L. & M., dated* 4*th July* 1932, *fixing the date of retirement of members of the Tiruvallur Taluk Board and for the coming into office of members of new taluk boards in the Chingleput district.*

42. [2]*G.O. No.* 652, *Development, dated* 12*th May* 1932, *recording the audit report on the accounts of the Industrial Engineering Workshop for the year ending with* 31*st March* 1931.

43. [3]*Communication from the Public (General) Department, dated* 27*th June* 1932, *with reference to clause (f) of question No.* 1223 *answered in the Legislative Council on the* 24*th March* 1932 *and the answer to the supplementary question thereto.*

44. [4]*U.O. Note No.* 10276–1, *Public (General), dated the* 18*th May* 1932, *with reference to the answer to clause (b) of question No.* 1119 *given in the Council on the* 24*th March* 1932.

45. [5]*Communication No.* 22334/*ER*/1, *dated* 11*th July* 1932, *from the Finance Department with reference to the question No.* 394 *and to supplementary question thereto on* 31*st October* 1931.

46. [6]*U.O. Note No.* 10130–2, *Public (General), dated* 9*th June* 1932, *with reference to the supplementary questions and answers given in the Legislative Council on the* 24*th March* 1932 *with reference to question No.* 1220.

47. [7]*U.O. Note No.* 8837–3, *Public (General), dated* 9*th June* 1932, *with reference to the answer to question No.* 1113 *given in the Legislative Council on the* 24*th March* 1932.

48. [1]*G.O. No.* 2576, *L. & M., dated* 4*th July* 1932, *notifying the exemption of a motor crane belonging to the Madura Mills Company, Ltd., from payment of tax.*

49. [2]*G.O. No.* 842 (20–*S*), *Development, dated* 20*th June* 1932, *passing orders on the audit report on the accounts of the Nilambur Forests division for the year ended* 31*st March* 1931.

50. [8]*Statement of action taken on resolutions passed by the Council during the Second Session of the Fourth Legislative Council.*

51. [2]*G.O. No.* 531, *Development, dated* 20*th April* 1932, *recording the audit report on the accounts of the Kerala Soap Institute, Calicut, for the year ending* 31*st March* 1931.

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

[1] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette.*
[2] Printed separately.
[3] Printed as Appendix XXXIII on page 150 infra.
[4] Printed as Appendix XXXIV on pages 150–151 infra.
[5] Printed as Appendix XXXV on page 152 infra.
[6] Printed as Appendix XXXVI on page 152 infra.
[7] Printed as Appendix XXXVII on page 153 infra.
[8] Printed as Appendix XXXVIII on pages 153—155 infra.

2nd August 1932]

APPENDIX I.

[Vide answer to question No. 7 asked by Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd August 1932, page 20 supra.]

To

The Hon'ble the HOME MEMBER,
Government of Madras,
Fort St. George.

HONOURED SIR,

I, the undersigned along with Mr. J. Pattabhiramayya, was picketing foreign cloth shops yesterday evening in the Robertsonpet square, Masulipatam. Police took us to the Robertsonpet station and kept us there till late in the night. They put us some questions about our property and our previous connexion with the Congress. Mr. Pattabhiramayya was let off with two blows at about 8-30 p.m. I was then taken into the lock up where two head constables handled me roughly.

One of them kicked me in the chest. I fell down. I was pulled up by the ears and the other kicked me in the back. I was beaten with a cane on the knees. I am feeling awful pain in the chest and am not able to breathe freely. I was let off at eleven in the night. One of the head constables spat on my face. I submit these facts for your sympathetic consideration.

BANDAR, Yours obediently,
28th *March* 1932. (Signed) PAMIREDDI GHANTAREDDI,
Dokiparru.

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to question No. 25 asked by Mr. R. M. Palat at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd August 1932, page 33 supra.]

Letter from the Collector of Malabar, Calicut, Ref. No. C. 7-5269/32, *dated 27th May* 1932.

[Cyclones—Malabar district—Damages.]

South Malabar was visited by a severe cyclonic storm on the night of May 24th. Though there was rain throughout the district, the strong wind, which was mainly from the west, was confined to portions of Calicut, Kurumbranad, Ernad and Ponnani taluks. The area affected runs along the coast from Quilandy in the north to Ponnani in the south and extends, so far as I can ascertain, about 20 miles inland. Trees have been blown down in large numbers all over this area, many houses

[2nd August 1932

have collapsed and about one house in four has sustained appreciable damage. Telegraph and telephone wires have been cut and roads blocked by fallen trees, and communications consequently seriously interrupted. Railway transport has not been interfered with but trains are running somewhat late owing to the interruption of telegraphic and telephonic communications and to fear of possible breaches.

2. So far no serious floods have occurred. As the rain abated on the 25th there was a tendency for the waters to subside but the Deputy Tahsildar, Tirurangady, reports that the Kadalundi river is rising. He is taking the necessary precautions to evacuate people from low-lying places.

3. So far I have had reports of 16 deaths, most of them of children, caused by the collapse of houses or by falling trees.

4. The female portion of the sub-jail, Calicut, was flooded out, the inmates being removed temporarily to the sub-jail office room and locked up there for the night guarded by the female warder. The cells were dried and made habitable next day.

5. The Branch Settlement Office at Calicut had a portion of its roof blown away and the records had to be taken to the Taluk office. The Malabar Club on the sea front suffered severely, large portions of the roof being blown away and billiard tables and other property being damaged.

6. There was no damage to shipping at the Port of Calicut. The total rainfall in Calicut from 8 a.m. on the 24th to 8 a.m. on the 25th was 10·75 inches.

7. Though the damage by the storm is heavy and widespread, there is not at present any need for relief measures on a large scale by Government. Individual sufferers will be given such help and shelter as is necessary. I will summon a meeting of the Malabar Distress Relief Fund Committee which has considerable funds at its disposal, should there be necessity to do so.

Letter from the Collector of Malabar, dated the 15th July 1932,
Ref. No. C. 7-5269/32.

[Cyclone—Malabar district—Damages—Report—My Ref. No. C. 7-5269/32, dated 27th May 1932.]

In continuation of the above report I submit a detailed account of the damage caused by the cyclone on the night of the 24th May.

Damage to human life.—Seven deaths have been reported from Ponnani, 17 from Ernad and 13 from Calicut taluk.

Damage to livestock.—Three hundred and forty-five head of cattle from Ponnani and 500 from Ernad are reported to have been lost. The loss under this item is not appreciable in Calicut taluk.

Public buildings.—A few public offices and amsam cutcherries have sustained slight damages but the loss on this account is not considerable.

2nd August 1932]

Communications.—Besides damage caused to local fund roads by wind-fallen trees, there were breaches in some of the roads as a result of the heavy rain. Damage was also caused to culverts and bridges. Damage to roads is estimated at Rs. 89,460; and to culverts and bridges at Rs. 1,39,600. The loss suffered by local fund building is about Rs. 4,500.

Dwelling houses.—In Ponnani taluk 4,164 dwelling houses have been blown down or made uninhabitable. These are mostly huts with mud walls and cadjan roofs or made of cadjan materials alone. The loss in individual cases will not be more than Rs. 10. About 500 private buildings have been similarly affected in Ernad taluk. In Calicut taluk 597 houses have collapsed while 480 have been partly damaged.

Boats.—Ninety boats were lost in Ponnani taluk due to the falling of trees.

Damage to crops.—Thousands of fruit-bearing trees, coconut, arecanut and jack, have been uprooted. The loss from the falling of trees is estimated at about Rs. 9 lakhs in each of the taluks of Ernad and Ponnani and about 1½ lakhs in Calicut taluk. These figures are of course only a rough general estimate. In addition to this, a large number of trees have had their roots loosened. This affects the young coconuts ripening on them and is likely to reduce their yield by about 25 per cent during the next eight months. The loss to paddy and other crops was negligible as the floods subsided quickly.

Relief measures.—A meeting of the Malabar Distress Relief Fund Committee was held on the 30th May and a sum of Rs. 2,000 was sanctioned from the funds of the Committee for relief in urgent and deserving cases. Another meeting was held on the 29th June and it was resolved that a further sum of Rs. 1,500 be made available for immediate relief of sufferers from the cyclone. The Malabar District Board and the Calicut Municipality have each proposed to contribute Rs. 200. These amounts will be available when sanction has been obtained from the Inspector of Local Boards and Municipal Councils. A sum of Rs. 180 was collected from Palghat by Rao Sahib N. N. Rama Ayyar and Mr. S. K. Ramaswami Ayyar, Chairman, Municipal Council, Palghat. The greater part of the funds available have already been distributed either by the aid of Government officials or by the workers of the Servants of India Society. In a portion of Calicut town the Malabar Welfare Association undertook the relief work, which they performed by the distribution of actual materials bought from the relief fund, among the fisher community who were badly affected. Their work involved the expenditure of much personal energy and time and was most particularly useful in that owing to the economic circumstances of these people, money grants would probably have got into the hands of their creditors. I wish to bring to the notice of Government the prompt and useful work done by Lady Barber, Miss M. Janaki and the Rev. A. T. Coldman in this respect.

[2nd August 1932

The remaining relief in the Municipality was distributed through the Chairman.

Although numerous petitions for assistance were received, relief was distributed only in cases verified by actual investigation. I consider that help has been given where it was really essential and that it was undesirable to attempt to do any more than this from charitable funds.

Appendix III.

[Vide answer to question No. 26 asked by Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd August 1932, page 33 supra.]

Statement showing the works for the employment of unskilled labourers in Bellary district during the second fortnight of May 1932.

I. *Road works*—

1. Laying out a road from Kurugodu to Emmiganuru.
2. Repairing the road from Kolur to Kurugodu.
3. Repairs to Bellary-Siruguppa road.
4. Laying out a road from Bellary to Talur—2 camps.
5. Completion of the road from Moka to Gulyam.
6. Repairing the road from the Goschen Bridge to the 20th mile, Bellary-Kurnool road—2 camps.
7. Laying out a road from Bellary to Siddamanahalli.
8. Laying out a road from Bevinahal railway station to Chintakunta.
9. Laying out a road from Yerur to Bantanahal railway station.
10. Repairs to the road from Bellary to Kudatini.

II. *Water-supply works*—

1. Three works at Chintakunta.
2. One work at Kokkarachedu.
3. One work at Sirugapuram.
4. One work at Bevinahal.
5. One work at Seedarahalu.
6. Two works at Gummanuru.
7. One work at Bantanahalu.

List of test works started in Bellary.

1. Road from Kolagal to Siddamanahalli.
2. Completion of road from Korlagundi to Talur, 1½ miles beyond Uluru.
3. Extension of road from Gulyam to Moka beyond Moka to Rupanagudi.
4. Extension of the Goschen Bridge-Madehal road to Alur *via* Hattibelegal.
5. Completion of the road from Chintakunta to Bevinahal railway station and of the Yerur-Bantanahal Railway station road.
6. Bellary-Siddaragadda road.
7. Yemmiganur-Kampli road.

2nd August 1932]

APPENDIX III-A.

[Vide answer to question No. 32 asked by Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd August 1932, page 37 supra.]

Copy of letter from the Chairman, Municipal Council, Nandyal, G.O. No. 169/32, dated the 22nd July 1932.

The land alluded to was acquired at the cost of the Municipal fund in the year 1905.

The land was divided into 145 plots. They were brought to sale in the year 1924. One hundred and twelve plots were sold and the remaining 33 were left unsold for want of bidders. The sale fetched a sum of Rs. 30,625. Immediately after the sale, some purchasers filed a suit in the local District Munsif's Court questioning the right of the Municipality to sell the sites instead of assigning them free of cost. The matter was under protracted litigation. In consequence the Council was unable to realize the purchase money. In 1927, it had to file suits and obtain decrees for the recovery of the purchase money. Some of the decree amounts have been realized. Other decrees are still pending execution. The collections in each of the years from 1924–25 to 1931–32 are given below:—

	RS.	A.	P.
1924–25	1,361	4	0
1925–26	3,285	0	0
1926–27	...		
1927–28	1,032	8	0
1928–29	...		
1929–30	...		
1930–31	2,115	0	0
1931–32	5,758	1	0
	13,551	13	0

A sum of Rs. 2,465 was written off being irrecoverable. There still remains a balance of Rs. 14,886–2–0 to be realized.

APPENDIX IV.

[Vide answer to question No. 33 asked by Mr. A. B. Shetty at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd August 1932, page 37 supra.]

Memorandum to the Chief Minister, the Government of Madras, presented at Madras on 21st March 1932 by Sir Alexander McDougall, Mr. G. L. Orchard, Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, Lieut.-Col. C. H. Brock, Mr. W. W. Ladden, Major F. Church and Mr. J. N. Peyton representing Indian Roads and Transport Development Association, Ltd., the Madras Chamber of Commerce, the Southern India Chamber of Commerce, the United Planters' Association of Southern India, the Madras Trades Association, the Automobile Association of Southern India, and the Madras Motor Vehicles and Allied Merchants Association.

MOTOR TRANSPORT AND TAXATION.

Taxation on the motor transport industry is now higher in India than in any other part of the world, and it is higher in the Madras Presidency than in other parts of India. The extent of this taxation is not often realized and details will, therefore, be of interest.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT TAXES.

Cars, Lorris and Bus Chassis.—Import duty is now 37½ per cent *ad valorem* on private cars and 25 per cent on lorries and bus chassis.

Petrol.—The Import duty and Excise was increased by a further 2 annas per gallon last October and has now reached the astonishing total of 10 annas per gallon. On the current price for petrol, the levy is in excess of 100 per cent *ad valorem.* In Madras City the selling rate *ex* pump is Rs. 1–5–0 per gallon, calculated as follows:—

	RS.	A.	P.	
Net rate	0	9	0	per gallon.
Retailer's commission ...	0	2	0	,,
Government tax ...	0	10	0	,,
	1	5	0	,,

so that the price to the public is nearly 50 per cent tax.

Motor Oils.—The Import duty is now two annas one pie per gallon.

Tyres.—The Import duty is now 25 per cent *ad valorem.*

Accessories.—The Import duty varies from 25 per cent to 37½ per cent.

2nd August 1932]

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT TAXES.

Private Cars.—Registration fee Rs. 16 on purchase.

Annual Provincial tax under the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931:—

Weighing not more than 15 cwt. unladen	Rs. 70	per annum.
,, from 15 cwt. to 30 cwt. ...	,, 100	,,
,, from 30 ,, to 45 ,, ...	,, 130	,,
,, from 45 ,, to 60 ,, ...	,, 160	,,
,, over 60 ,, ...	,, 200	,,
Buses.—Registration fee	,, 16	on purchase.
Government permit	,, 16	per annum.
Brake testing fee	,, 50	,,

Annual Provincial Tax under the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931, Rs. 920 per annum. (By a concession of the Madras Government Rs. 690 only was collected in 1931–32.)

DISTRICT BOARD TAXES.

Private cars are exempted. The taxes collected as licence fees on buses differ in the various districts, but Rs. 1,100 per annum per bus represents the average figure.

In order to realize the full burden of this taxation it is necessary to examine the running expenses of a bus and a private car owner and the figures set out below give a fair indication of annual costs:—

Bus—

	Total cost per annum.		Taxation per annum.	
	RS.	A.	RS.	A.
Initial cost of bus at Rs. 3,500 to be written off in three years—Duty at Rs. 650	1,166	0	216	0
Registration Rs. 16	5	5	5	5
Government permit	16	0	16	0
Brake testing fee	50	0	50	0
Provincial tax	690	0	690	0
District Board Licence fee	1,100	0	1,100	0
2,400 gallons of petrol per annum at an average of Rs. 1–9–0 per gallon	3,750	0	1,500	0
Motor oil	216	0	9	6
12 new tyres and 6 inner tubes ...	960	0	178	0
Spare parts	300	0	37	0
	8,253	5	3,801	11

In addition the bus owner must pay wages if he or members of his family do not act as driver and conductor. In the case of a bus owner operating on a large scale he must pay wages for his staff, and if he makes

[2nd August 1932

sufficient profit, a further levy is imposed upon him in the form of income and profession tax; thereby making a further contribution to the general revenue part of which is used for the upkeep of the roads.

Private car (15 to 30 cwt.)—

	Total cost per annum. RS.	A.	Taxation per annum. RS.	A.
Initial cost of car Rs. 4,000 to be written off in five years—Duty at Rs. 1,025	800	0	205	0
Registration at Rs. 16 on purchase.	3	3	3	3
Provincial tax under Madras Motor Vehicles Act, 1931	100	0	100	0
500 gallons of petrol per annum at an average of Rs. 1-9-0 per gallon	781	0	312	0
Motor oil	60	0	1	9
4 new tyres and 4 inner tubes ...	180	0	32	0
Spare parts	300	0	55	0
Wages	250	0	...	
	2,474	3	708	12

Thus a private car owner spends approximately Rs. 2,474 per annum on his car and out of this amount he contributes no less than Rs. 708 in taxation, or 29 per cent. The burden of the bus owner is, however, staggering. Out of a total expenditure of about Rs. 8,253 he contributes Rs. 3,802 in taxation or approximately 46 per cent of the whole. Out of every rupee which he spends, 7·36 annas is taxation.

It is of course well known how this state of affairs has arisen. In past years the motor transport trade has given an impression of false prosperity and all taxation authorities from the Central Government to the district boards in their search for means of raising revenue have imposed increasingly heavier taxes. There would appear to have been little co-operation between the authorities concerned and no effort made to ascertain the economic limit of taxation. There is some doubt regarding the total number of buses in the Madras Presidency, but the latest figures indicate that there are about four thousands owned by, say, 3,000 individuals. It is not equitable that this small group of 3,000 should be expected to contribute about 152 lakhs of rupees in taxation.

The present position of the bus industry has been described fully in the Legislative Council, in the petitions which have been presented to Government and in the Press. Buses are being withdrawn from the road in large numbers as their owners have come to the end of their resources, while those still in operation are running at a loss. Many of the poorer owners are only enabled to continue their business by obtaining an extension of their hire-purchase terms and through the generous credit

terms given by the petrol retailers. A large proportion of the bus business is thus being carried by the firms financing hire-purchase and by the petrol trade. This state of affairs cannot continue and a crisis in the trade is rapidly approaching. The sale of new buses is at a standstill. The sale of tyres and accessories has declined heavily. The sale of petrol which has increased every year since 1923 fell in 1931 for the first time. It is a significant fact that the drop in the petrol trade followed immediately the imposition of an additional 2 annas on the petrol Excise duty and the introduction of the Madras Motor Vehicles Act in April last year. With a further addition of 2 annas in the Excise duty in October the decline in petrol sales was accelerated. Thus while trade generally is improving in the Presidency and showing distinct signs of revival the position of the motor transport trade becomes steadily worse. The final result can only be an enormous reduction in the number of buses on the road and the ruin of all the small owners. The small bus owner has played a great part in providing quick and cheap communications in rural districts, and if he has himself profited, his enterprise has at the same time conferred great benefit on the community. It is neither just nor expedient to tax him out of existence.

It is not generally realized that the bus trade consumes approximately 80 per cent of the total sales of petrol. The partial extinction of the bus trade will, therefore, mean an enormous loss of revenue to the Central Government who now derive 10 annas on every gallon sold. The Provincial Government will suffer a corresponding loss as 20 per cent of this amount is allocated to the Provinces for road construction. There will be a further heavy drop in the receipts from import duty on new cars, and a loss in revenue on the collection under the Madras Motor Vehicles Act and the District Board Licence fees. The facts are perfectly plain. Three taxing authorities at the same time and acting independently have seen fit to bring about a drastic increase in the taxation on a particular Industry and the ruin of that Industry is the result. The responsibility must be shared by the Central Government, the Provincial Government and the District Boards, and it is essential that these bodies should act together to reduce the burden of taxation.

With regard to the petrol Excise duty of 10 annas a gallon it is necessary that either the Central Government should be prepared to reduce the Excise or else allocate to the Provinces a far larger proportion of the amount collected, so as to enable these authorities to reduce their direct taxation, or to make such grants to the District Boards as will enable them to reduce their licence fees.

The drastic amendment of the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931, is also essential, as it is now obvious that this Act has failed completely to bring about its original objects.

It is understood that in introducing the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act of 1931 it was the intention of the Government of Madras to encourage the development of the industry by the abolition of tolls. The Indian Road Development Committee rightly condemned the system of tolls and the Madras Government accepted their recommendation to

[2nd August 1932

abolish them. In their statement of objects and reasons the Government say "The Indian Road Development Committee have condemned the system of tolls and it is considered necessary to terminate this system not only on account of the annoyance it causes to the road-using public and especially to fast-moving traffic, but to an even greater degree on account of its wastefulness as a method of collecting revenue from road-using vehicles. . . It is proposed, therefore, to abolish all tolls and to substitute vehicle taxation."

The system of tolls was based on the principle that the user of the road must pay for its use: so much so that it levied a toll on bullock carts and other vehicles that used the road. If a vehicle did not use certain roads, it paid no tolls. This older system of collection, based on a correct principle, was however, wrong in its application. In the attempt to effect a change in the collection of the dues, the Madras Motor Vehicles Act committed the error of losing sight entirely of the principle that the tax on vehicles is levied for the use of the road. The act provides for the taxation of all motor vehicles, some of which do not use public roads, and exempts from taxation vehicles such as bullock carts, bandies, etc. The exemption from tax of other vehicles other than motor vehicles has added an unfair burden to motor transport which has to make good the revenue lost by these exemptions.

The Government communique, dated 30th March 1931, published for the purpose of helping the public readily to acquaint themselves with the provisions of the Act, puts the proposition clearly and emphatically and in italics: "*The vehicle need not be actually used; even if it is merely to be kept, the tax is to be paid.*" The same communique says that the effect of the Act is that carts kept outside the Municipal or Corporation limits are to pay no tax, and are not liable to pay any tolls even though they enter the Municipal limits and use the roads. It is wrong in principle to exempt from taxation the road-wearing bullock carts and bandies. It has been stated that the exemption of bullock carts, etc., from taxation is to the benefit of agriculture. Such an argument is not equitable by reason of the fact that motor trucks used solely for agricultural purposes are not exempt under the Act.

The Motor Vehicles Taxation Act leaves untouched the provisions of the Madras Local Boards Act and the District Municipalities Act which prohibit the use of motor vehicles and motor lorries for hire on any public road within the jurisdiction of the Local Bodies except on a Licence obtainable from the Chairman of the Municipality or the President of the District Board. These bodies have chosen to levy fees which though termed licence fees, are, in reality, taxes. The preamble to the Motor Vehicles Taxation Act states clearly that it was passed because it was "expedient to abolish the levy of tolls on motor vehicles by Local Bodies within the Madras Presidency." But the Act is defeated by the power of the Local Bodies to levy licence fees under the District Municipalities Act and the Local Boards Act.

It is recognized throughout the world that a licence fee is a collection solely for the purpose of meeting the expenses of supervision. The

2nd August 1932]

Act, by virtue of its preamble, clearly shows that its original intention was that it should be the sole tax on motor transport, and that in addition licences of a small amount only should be levied by District Boards to cover the cost of supervision and control of motor transport plying for hire in their respective districts.

The necessity of revising the Madras Local Boards Act and the District Municipalities Act has been clearly shown by the judgments delivered on the 14th March by Mr. Justice Waller and Mr. Justice Krishnan Pandalai in the recent Criminal appeal case, The Malabar District Board *v.* various bus owners. The latter had appealed against a conviction in Malabar for failure to pay District Board Licence fees on the grounds that such licence fees were in actual fact taxes and therefore illegal. The learned judges, were, however, unable to agree on this point and the case has been referred to a third judge.

The hard fact remains, however, that revenue must be raised, and it is agreed that the Motor Transport Industry must bear its share—but no more than its just share. It is admitted that the industry is now being treated with grave injustice, and also that at present excessive taxation is defeating its object by strangling motor transport. The result can only be a diminution of revenue.

Experience has shown in all countries that a reasonable tax on petrol is probably the most equitable—the present tax is unreasonable in amount and disposal. The petrol tax is carried by the consumer throughout the year, and therefore, causes the minimum disturbance to his business. Much of the present difficulty of the Madras bus owner can be attributed to the necessity of finding large sums quarterly or half-yearly to meet the Provincial Tax and District Board licence fees. But the Central Government now retains 80 per cent of the petrol tax, and if the whole of this vast sum was passed on to the Provincial Governments and utilized in part for grants to the District Boards the position would be greatly improved. If, however, it is impossible for the Central Government to relinquish their share of the petrol tax, the Provincial Government must turn to other sources of revenue. The most destructive vehicle on the road is the bullock cart, yet it pays nothing towards the upkeep of the roads. The solution therefore is to tax all vehicles on the road. This is both just and expedient. Even if this involves the re-establishment of tolls for non-mechanical transport, it would be preferable to the present state of affairs.

The Motor Transport Industry is now at the mercy of three taxing authorities. Co-ordination and a uniform policy is essential. A central authority should be established either Provincial or for all India, and a progressive policy initiated to encourage Motor Transport. Road Transport is less developed in India than in almost any country of the world and its potentialities are enormous. The only solution is a wholesale reduction in taxation and a vigorous policy of expansion.

Meanwhile to provide immediate relief, the following adjustment should be made in the present scale of taxes and licence fees.

[2nd August 1932

The Provincial tax should be reduced to Rs. 5 per seat excluding driver and conductor per quarter.

District Board Licence fees should be limited to a maximum not exceeding Rs. 5 per seat per quarter.

Both tax and licence fee should be collected quarterly, Provincial tax on the 1st January, 1st April, 1st July and 1st October and District Board licence fees on the 1st February, 1st May, 1st August and the 1st November. This arrangement will spread the incidence as much as possible.

A bus owner taking out a licence or paying Provincial tax in the last month of any quarter should be permitted to pay two-fifths of the quarter tax or licence fee.

District Boards should be granted power to levy a tax on bullock carts and other users of their roads. If no other local means of obtaining revenue from bullock carts and other non-mechanical vehicles can be devised, each vehicle should be registered and numbered on similar lines as those adopted for cars, buses and lorries at a suitable registration fee. The Police should be given powers to stop any unregistered vehicle of all types.

The Provincial Government should take immediately steps to press upon the Central Government the equity of their claim to a larger proportion of the duty/excise on petrol and import duties on motor vehicles parts and accessories to be applied to the reduction of Provincial and Local Taxation of motor vehicles and the construction and maintenance of roads in the Presidency.

APPENDIX V.

[Vide answer to question No. 35 asked by Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd August 1932, page 38 supra.]

Statement.

Districts in which Temple Committees are not functioning at present.

Name of district.	Date of expiry of the term of the Committee.
1. Anantapur	20— 5—30
2. Arcot, North	10—12—30
3. Bellary	6—10—30
4. Chingleput—	
Chingleput Circle Committee	27— 5—30
Tiruvallur Circle Committee	17— 6—30
5. Chittoor	10— 6—30

Name of district.	Date of expiry of the term of the Committee.
6. Coimbatore—	
Erode Circle Committee	5— 5—31
Coimbatore Circle Committee	18— 8—31
7. Cuddapah	12— 3—30
8. Ganjam	1—10—30
9. East Godavari	16— 9—30
10. West Godavari	13— 8—30
11. Guntur	8—10—30
12. Kistna	18— 2—31
13. Kurnool	14—10—30
14. * Madura—	
Palni Circle Committee	30— 6—29
Madura Circle Committee	20— 8—29
Periyakulam Circle Committee ...	20— 8—29
15. Nellore	2— 9—30
16. Nilgiris	19— 5—31
17. Ramnad	25— 2—31
18. Salem—	
Salem Circle Committee	15— 4—30
Tiruchengodu Circle Committee ...	29— 4—30
Dharmapuri Circle Committee	15— 4—30
19. South Kanara	7— 5—31
20. Trichinopoly—	
Trichinopoly Circle Committee ...	25— 3—31
Turaiyur Circle Committee	25— 3—31
Ariyalur Circle Committee	25— 3—31
21. Vizagapatam	12— 8—30
22. Malabar (no committee has been constituted for this district until now).	

Appendix VI.

[Vide answer to question No. 42 asked by Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd August 1932, page 44 supra.]

Press Communiqué of the Government of Madras, Revenue Department, dated Stonehouse Hill, the 29th June 1932.

In December last, the Collector of Bellary reported that, owing to lack of rain in Bellary taluk, a failure of crops was apprehended and that in many villages labourers were migrating in search of employment.

* The Madura Sri Minakshi Sundareswarar Devasthanam and its allied institutions are under the jurisdiction of a separate temple committee which is functioning.

[2nd August 1932

The Collector recommended that road works should be started to provide employment for unskilled labour; and the Government sanctioned a grant of Rs. 20,000 for the formation of a road from Kurugodu to Emmiganur. Subsequently it was found that similar conditions prevailed in parts of Siruguppa, Alur, Rayadrug and Hospet taluks, and nine other road works and thirteen water-supply works were started. The Government made grants to the District Board, Bellary, and Taluk Board, Adoni, covering almost the whole estimated cost of the works. The special grants sanctioned by the Government amounted to Rs. 1,80,000.

2. The kist season had meanwhile begun. Arrears of land revenue of three previous faslis (1338—1340) were outstanding in many villages of Bellary, Siruguppa, Alur and Rayadrug taluks, the collection having been postponed owing to unfavourable seasons in those years. It was clear that concessions would be necessary again this fasli. The local officers carefully inspected the areas affected, and the Government accepted the recommendations of the Collector and Board of Revenue for the remission or further postponement of the arrears, and also for the remission or postponement of a great part of the demand of the current fasli. The amount remitted outright in these areas is nearly 4½ lakhs of rupees, and the amount, the collection of which has been suspended till next year, is more than Rs. 2½ lakhs.

3. In addition to these reliefs, the Government decided to postpone the collection in the area affected of instalments of loans granted under the Loans Acts which were due in the current fasli. The amount of these dues is nearly 4¼ lakhs of rupees. In 1930 the loans granted in many villages of the district were treated as having been made free of interest and the interest previously collected was credited towards the principal. Proposals for extending this concession to five additional villages are under consideration.

4. Towards the end of April, proposals for starting new works to provide employment for unskilled labourers were being received. The Government, having regard to the large sums already spent for the purpose out of general revenues, and the sacrifice of a great part of the amounts payable by the ryots as land revenue and repayment of loans, considered that before further expenditure was sanctioned, the report contemplated by section 46 (*a*) of the Famine Code should be obtained on the economic condition of the tract affected, and the probable intensity and duration of distress. The Government, on considering that report and obtaining information as to the system of work, the tasks imposed, and the wages paid on the works which were being carried out by the local boards from the special grants sanctioned by the Government, found that the tasks were lighter and the wages higher than those laid down in the Famine Code for relief works. They therefore decided that the expenditure from Government revenues of further sums which might run into lakhs of rupees on works devised for the prevention of distress could not be justified unless proofs were forthcoming that the conditions prevailing were such as to warrant a declaration that relief should

2nd August 1932]

be administered in the manner prescribed in the Famine Code. The procedure laid down for ascertaining the existence of such conditions is the opening of " test works "—i.e., works run in a manner calculated to test whether a considerable number of persons would be willing to work for a bare subsistence. Accordingly five works were selected as " test works." These were opened under the administration of the Collector at the beginning of June: two more test works have since been sanctioned. The remaining local board works were shut down until the result of the test should be ascertained. The wages to be paid on these test works were those laid down in the Famine Code, with the addition of 25 per cent which was specially sanctioned because the fall in the price of condiments had not been so great as that in the price of grain. By the grant of a permanent advance the Collector was provided with unlimited funds for the purpose of running the works. The District Board Engineer was relieved of other duties and placed in charge of the works, and a special staff was sanctioned for supervising the payments.

5. In the " test " stage of famine operations, gratuitous relief may not be given to the dependants of workers. As regards others, the Government considered the question whether, along with the opening of the test works, it was necessary to make provision for the distribution of gratuitous relief in the form of food or money to destitute persons incapable of work. The Collector and the Settlement Commissioner agreed in reporting that the physical condition of the people was good, and that emaciation was not observed: and the Government therefore decided that no gratuitous relief need for the present be distributed. The Collector has, however, been informed that if he considers it necessary to adopt any such measures he may report the facts for the orders of the Government.

6. The number of persons employed by the local boards on the works under their charge had in May risen to nearly 20,000. When test-works were introduced the number fell, but rose later and on June 24th stood at over 14,000. It is ordinarily contemplated that test-works shall remain open only for a few weeks: but the Government have been unable to decide on the need for relief-works as soon as they had hoped, because it was found that the wages payable on the test-works were being supplemented in an unauthorized manner. They have therefore been compelled to continue the test, with conditions strictly limited to those which had been ordered; and the present position is that they are observing the result in order to decide at the earliest possible moment whether relief-works should be opened.

J. A. THORNE,
Secretary to Government

APPENDIX VII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 99 supra.]

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

MEMORANDUM.

[Irrigation—(Guntur)—Repalle taluk—Higher falling shutters to the Kistna anicut—Introduction—Extent of dry lands unfit for wet cultivation.]

At the meeting of the Legislative Council held on 3rd November 1931, M.R.Ry. G. Simhachalam Avargal, M.L.C., enquired

(*a*) what the extent of dry lands was in the year immediately preceding the introduction of the increased shutters to the Kistna anicut, held by the ryots in the Repalle taluk, Guntur district, which were unfit for dry cultivation and useless to those ryots unless brought under irrigation;

(*b*) how much of that extent had been sanctioned for irrigation since then;

(*c*) how much of it was still lying waste;

(*d*) what the reason for not extending the benefit of irrigation to those lands was; and

(*e*) whether the Government were aware that most of these lands were lands situated at the tail-ends of irrigation canals, and could easily be irrigated with much less water than elsewhere and with no additional cost to them.

The hon. the Revenue Member stated in reply that a report had been called for and undertook to consider the question of placing the report on the table of the House when it was received. The report has been received and the particulars required are given below:—

	ACS.
(1) Extent of dry lands in the delta tracts of Repalle taluk, which were not cultivated with 'dry' crops in the year immediately preceding the introduction of 6 feet shutters at Kistna anicut	26,075
(2) Extent of dry lands in item (1) for which irrigation has been sanctioned since then.	12,087
(3) Remainder	13,988

The lands which might be brought under irrigation are scattered and would come under various channels. The question of arranging for their irrigation is engaging the attention of the Public Works Department.

J. A. THORNE,
Secretary to Government.

21*st March* 1932.

APPENDIX VIII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 99 supra.]

PUBLIC (SERVICES) DEPARTMENT.

COMMUNICATION TO THE COUNCIL.

With reference to the supplementary answer given to question No. 774, asked at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 28th January 1932, the following information is laid on the table:—

Legislative Council question No. 774 answered on 28th January 1932.

No Europeans were sent abroad during the triennium ending with the 31st December 1931 with State aid or scholarships for special study.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office.

APPENDIX IX.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 99 supra.]

A SURVEY OF THE FLOODS WHICH OCCURRED IN THE GANJAM, VIZAGAPATAM AND WEST GODAVARI DISTRICTS IN OCTOBER AND NOVEMBER 1931.

Origin and course of the storm.—Following upon disturbed weather conditions, a storm developed on the morning of the 13th October 1931 about 60 miles east of Calingapatam. It crossed the coast on 14th October 1931 and caused widespread rain in the North Madras Coast. In the Ganjam district the rains were unusually heavy in the basin of the Nagavalli river and the southern and western parts of the Chicacole taluk. In the Vizagapatam district the rainfall was unprecedentedly heavy on the 13th, 14th and 15th. The rainfall recorded on the 14th was 21·50 inches at Pottanghi, 14·10 inches at Vizianagram, 13·94 inches at Chipurapalle and between 10 and 11 inches at Srungavarapukota, Bimlipatam, Bobbili and Salur. On the 31st October and the 1st November 1931, there was again heavy rainfall throughout Vizagapatam district. In the West Godavari district also there were heavy rains towards the end of October and the beginning of November. Owing to the heavy rainfall many of the rivers and drains in the three districts were in floods during the period.

In the Ganjam district, the floods spread over an area 3 miles in width and over 16 miles in length all along the Nagavalli river from Kottavalasa to Mufuzbundar.

In Vizagapatam, nine taluks in the plains and four in the Agency were affected by the floods. Almost all the rivers and streams in this area were in full floods. On account of the heavy rain the soil round the roots of trees on the slopes of hills in Pottanghi and Padwa taluks became soaked and trees fell and started an avalanche of mud and boulders which poured down the hill sides. There seem to have been some hundreds of these landslips and the total number of villages damaged in the Vizagapatam district was 228.

In the West Godavari district the drains in the Bhimavaram, Tadepalligudem and Ellore taluks overflowed submerging the low-lying tracts of the three taluks. All the drains fall into the Colair; the floods in the Colair were the highest received since 1917.

2. *Damage—(a) Loss of life—Ganjam.*—So far as information is available, only two lives were lost and one person is reported to be missing.

Vizagapatam.—The total number of lives lost was 333. There were 214 deaths in Pottanghi and Padwa taluks alone, mostly due to landslips which overwhelmed small villages at the foot of the hills.

West Godavari.—There was no loss of human life.

(*b*) *Loss of livestock—Ganjam.*—There has been some loss but the number has not been reported.

Vizagapatam.—The number of bulls, cows, goats, sheep and pigs lost is about 6,300.

West Godavari.—Some cattle-sheds collapsed and four head of cattle were lost.

(*c*) *Loss of and damage to houses and other private property—Ganjam.*—One thousand eight hundred and sixty-six houses were ruined and the occupants were rendered homeless.

Vizagapatam.—The number of families rendered homeless was 4,679.

West Godavari.—In the Ellore taluk, 669 houses were affected in the villages round the Colair in the Ellore taluk. Of these seventeen collapsed, and the rest were vacated on account of water in them. Two hundred and fifteen houses in Bhimadole village collapsed. About 200 huts were damaged in the Colair villages of the Bhimavaram taluk.

(*d*) *Destruction and damage to cultivation—Ganjam.*—The crop on about 150 acres of land was lost. A small area has also been covered with sand or eroded.

Vizagapatam—Plains.—About 3,700 acres of cultivated land were submerged or otherwise damaged. The area covered with sand is about 200 acres. The total loss of crops is estimated at Rs. 1,50,000.

Agency.—There was not much damage to crops and fields in Pottanghi taluk. In Padwa taluk several fields cultivated with jholla were heavily inundated and in some villages many paddy fields were covered with sand and boulders which not only destroyed the crop but

also rendered the land permanently unfit for cultivation. Roughly a tenth of the wet paddy in the taluk was spoiled. In Jeypore taluk, all the fields bordering on the Kolab river in 26 villages near Kotta were damaged or silted up. The loss in Malkangiri taluk was considerable. Ragi, cholam, chillies and paddy were completely washed away or considerably ruined in the villages affected. Much land was also silted up.

West Godavari.—The wet crops on about 22,350 acres in Bhimavaram taluk, 2,000 acres in Tadepalligudem taluk and 24,010 acres in Ellore taluk are reported to have been affected. The area silted up is insignificant.

(*e*) *Damage to Government property other than irrigation works—Ganjam.*—The wall of the District Munsif's Court, Chicacole, was damaged. The repair is estimated to cost Rs. 680.

Vizagapatam—Plains.—Considerable damage has been caused to cattle-pounds in Salur, Bobbili, Palakonda and Vizianagram taluks. One cattle-pound in Bobbili taluk was washed away. In the Anakapalle taluk, portions of the compound walls behind the Taluk office and the Sub-Registrar's office had to be pulled down to facilitate the discharge of flood water. The Police lines at Sitanagram were slightly damaged. A dozen village-sites were badly silted up in Palakonda taluk. The village records and the survey instruments of Mugguru were carried away by the Nagavalli; some of the records were, however, recovered later in Chicacole. The village records of five villages in the Vizianagram taluk were either washed away or damaged.

Agency.—In the Malkangiri taluk the rest-house at Kondakamberu washed away and the cattle-pound at Motu was damaged. Some of the Police huts at Padwa were slightly affected. Except the damage to the Itikavalasa-Jeypore road and the bridge over the Kolab river, no serious damage was done to Government buildings and roads. The road from Salur to Jeypore was repaired and made fit for through light motor traffic by about the middle of November 1931.

(*f*) *Damage to irrigation works—Ganjam.*—The estimate of damage done to minor irrigation works is Rs. 7,500.

In the Ganjam minor rivers system there were six breaches in the channels taking off from the Langulya river and the Girisola channel was slightly silted up in places. There was some damage to the tanks, canals and channels in the Rushikulya system. The total cost of repairing the damage is estimated at about Rs. 25,500.

Vizagapatam.—Seventy irrigation works including tanks were damaged. The repairs are estimated to cost Rs. 23,000.

There were abnormal floods in the Sarada river which caused eight breaches. The urgent repairs required for the irrigation of standing crops were put in hand. The bank of the Kondakerla Ava breached in four places; arrangements were made immediately to close the breaches to hold water for second crop.

[2nd August 1932

In the Parvatipur subdivision, nine river channels and ten tanks were affected though not severely. In the Nagavalli irrigation system, there were minor breaches and erosions in the channels and distributaries but these were closed and normal flow in the main channel was kept up.

The total cost of repairing the damage to Public Works Department irrigation works in the district is estimated at Rs. 69,000.

West Godavari.—A big breach was caused in the right bank of the Yanamaduru drain in Bhimavaram taluk and breaches also occurred in the bunds of six irrigation tanks in the district.

There was very little damage to major irrigation works. The cost of repairing the small damage and closing a few breaches is estimated at Rs. 5,000.

(*g*) *Damage to communications—Ganjam.*—The Great Northern Trunk Road, the Chicacole-Calingapatam road, the Srikurmam road, the Chicacole-Palakonda road and some village roads were damaged. The cost of repairs to the first four roads is estimated at Rs. 17,000. The Ganjam District Board is taking steps to repair the damage and the question of affording relief to the District Board by way of grants for this purpose is under the consideration of Government. A grant of Rs. 3,090 has also been sanctioned towards the cost of repairs to roads in the Anakapalle Municipality.

Vizagapatam—Agency.—Roads and bridges were badly affected. In the Pottanghi taluk the foot bridge at Pithaguda over the Upper Kolab, another bridge on the Turner's Ghaut Road near Pottanghi, the Public Works Department bridge at Doliamba, and both approaches to the bridge at Sunki were washed away. The Itikavalasa-Pottanghi Ghaut Road and the approaches to the Tuba and Cyaliput culverts on the Sembliguda-Padwa Road were also damaged. In the Padwa taluk, the Anantagiri Ghaut Road was badly damaged and practically every large culvert on the Padwa-Minimulur Road was washed away. The road to a length of about 200 yards on the tank-bund near Salimi and the wooden bridge over the Saptadhara river in the Malkangiri taluk were also washed away.

Vizagapatam—Plains.—The cost of repairs to the trunk and second-class roads in the district is estimated at Rs. 1·4 lakhs and 2·4 lakhs respectively. The District Board has been authorized to proceed with the repairs in anticipation of assistance from Provincial funds.

West Godavari.—The masonry drainage sluice of the C.A.D. Corporation was completely washed away. A breach, about fifty feet in length, occurred in the Great Northern Trunk Road near Bhimadole in Ellore taluk.

3. *Measures of relief—Ganjam.*—The Government sanctioned an amount of Rs. 2,000 for the relief of distress. A flood relief committee was formed under the instructions and guidance of the Collector and it was able to raise public subscriptions amounting to Rs. 4,000. The

2nd August 1932]

District Board, the Taluk Board, Chicacole, and the Chicacole Municipality contributed Rs. 1,000 each. A sum of Rs. 2,000 was distributed immediately to the deserving poor.

Vizagapatam—Agency.—Practically nothing could be done in the Agency taluks of Padwa, Pottanghi, Malkangiri and Jeypore, to mitigate the effects of the floods as they rose and passed away within 24 hours. The whole damage in Pottanghi taluk is said to have been done in 15 minutes. Some villagers who were surrounded by floods in Chalanaput village were rescued with the help of elephants lent by the Jeypore Estate. The Estate offered loans of paddy in Pottanghi and Padwa taluks. The plying of boats by a boat contractor of the Baster States considerably helped the rescue work at Motu.

Plains.—Palkonda was the only taluk where nothing could be done as the rivers came down suddenly in floods. Elsewhere everything which could be done to mitigate the effects of the floods was carried out with foresight and promptness. In Anakapalle taluk, the road near the local fund bridge was cut in three places in order to facilitate the discharge of the flood water. The people in the locality were induced to leave their houses with their chattels and live-stock in good time. Currency notes, opium, stamps and other valuables kept in the sub-treasury were secured on the record racks of the Taluk office. As already mentioned the compound walls behind the Taluk office and the Sub-Registrar's office were pulled down to ensure the free and rapid discharge of flood water. The river embankment was strengthened in several places to prevent breaches.

The Government sanctioned Rs. 10,000 towards the relief of distress in the district. A sum of about Rs. 7,500 was placed at the disposal of the subordinate officers for making small cash grants to the destitute for the purchase of food and clothing. Proposals for the grant of relief to an extent of Rs. 2,400 are under scrutiny. Relief committees were formed and grain and building material were granted freely, the latter from Government porambokes where available.

West Godavari.—The immediate relief required was the provision of shelter to the people who were rendered homeless. The Collector granted free of cost 215 palmyra trees standing on Government porambokes to the people in Bhimadole whose houses had collapsed. Free grants of trees and leaves were made to the poor people in the villages round the Colair and steps are being taken to provide water for the second-crop irrigation inasmuch of the affected area as possible.

4. *Repair of irrigation works—Ganjam.*—Six estimates for the repair of damaged tanks have been submitted to the Collector for sanction. There are enough funds to carry out the works.

Vizagapatam.—In the Salur taluk, almost all the minor breaches in the tanks have been closed by the ryots concerned, and the big breaches also have been temporarily repaired by them. In the Bobbili taluk, the villagers have temporarily closed the breaches in tanks in

[2nd August 1932

all the villages affected except Lingamvalasa. In this village the breaches in the minor irrigation tanks have been closed temporarily by the village headman at small cost.

In the Sarvasiddhi taluk, three breaches in the Babakhan channel and three in the Goparaju channel have been closed by the ryots. In the Viravilli taluk, one breach in the Lakshmipuram big tank was repaired by the estate, but the tank breached again later owing to the heavy rain on 31st October 1931.

In the Palkonda taluk, ten breaches in minor irrigation tank bunds have been closed by the ryots concerned, and in the Vizianagram taluk temporary repairs have been executed to the tanks in four villages by private individuals.

West Godavari.—In Tadepalligudem taluk, the breaches in a small minor irrigation tank of Ungutur and Vadupu tank of Tadepalli were immediately closed by the ryots. A temporary ring bund was formed by the ryots to prevent damage by the breaching of the Velagalamma tank of Kuchanpudi. The breaches in the Idula cheruvu, Ura cheruvu and Timmanna cheruvu also were closed by the ryots.

Repairs to minor irrigation works in the charge of the Revenue Department in all the three districts have either already been carried out or are in progress and will be completed shortly. It is expected that the repairs to the irrigation works in the charge of the Public Works Department will be completed before the next irrigation season.

5. *Assistance towards economic reconstruction—Ganjam.*—The Collector reports that an amount of Rs. 10,000 is likely to be required under the Land Improvement and Agriculturists' Loans Acts to give relief to cultivators whose lands have been covered with sand and who have lost their cattle. The amount will be sanctioned when needed.

Remission of revenue will be granted under the rules contained in Board's Standing Order No. 13. The amount of remission of revenue anticipated on account of flood damage is Rs. 15,000.

Vizagapatam.—Advances under the Loans Act will be granted where necessary. The possibility of forming co-operative societies for advancing loans to deserving persons for the construction of a better class of houses is being explored in the Vizianagram taluk. In the case of some of the villages affected by flood steps are being taken in consultation with the Vizianagram Estate to select new village-sites which will be less exposed to flood damage.

Remission of revenue will be granted under the provisions of Board's Standing Order No. 13. The amount to be remitted is estimated at Rs. 21,000.

West Godavari.—Remission of revenue was granted under the provisions of Board's Standing Order No. 13. The amount remitted exceeds Rs. 44,000.

2nd August 1932]

6. *Measures to prevent the recurrence of the floods or to mitigate their effects—Ganjam.*—The question of the formation of a flood bank for the Nagavalli is under correspondence between the Collector and the Executive Engineer. The Collector has been asked to obtain the opinion of the officers of the Public Works Department in regard to the necessity for a larger number of vents in the railway line between Dusi railway station and Kanugulavalasa village towards Chicacole road railway station.

Vizagapatam.—It seems that the podu cultivation in the hills of Madgole is the chief reason for the heavy floods in the Sarada river. The Collector is considering what steps should be taken to prevent the cutting of trees on the hill slopes. An estimate for providing more vents to the bridge on the road near Anakapalle is under consideration.

7. *General.*—The storm of the 13th-14th October was unprecedented. No such storm has been known in the Agency tracts within the memory of man. At the time of the deluge most of the tanks in the plains taluks of Vizagapatam were full owing to the rain in the latter part of September and early October and few could withstand the enormously increased supply. The fact that 45 Government tanks in Palkonda taluk were considerably affected in spite of expenditure regularly incurred upon maintenance shows that few tanks could have withstood the torrents of water poured into them. There is, however, no doubt that the unsatisfactory condition of many estate tanks to some extent contributed to the heaviness of the floods. So far as the Agency tracts are concerned, there appears to be nothing that can be done to mitigate the effects of such exceptional rainfall. The storm of the 13th-14th October although of great severity was fortunately not accompanied by wind and the weather became fine and dry after the storm had passed. The people who had been rendered homeless were thus spared further difficulties and fortunately there were no epidemics. The Government desire to record their appreciation of the good work done by officials and non-officials in relieving distress and repairing damage.

J. A. THORNE,
Secretary to Government.

APPENDIX X.

[Vide item X—Pāpers laid on the Table of the House—page 99 supra.]

A SURVEY OF THE FLOODS WHICH OCCURRED IN THE TINNEVELLY, TRICHINOPOLY, TANJORE AND SOUTH ARCOT DISTRICTS IN DECEMBER 1931.

1. *Causes and extent of the floods.*—About the end of the first week of December 1931 a storm developed some distance off the Coromandel Coast and moving towards the Peninsula caused abnormal rainfall in

some of the southern districts of the Presidency, mainly in South Arcot, Tanjore, Trichinopoly and Tinnevelly and between the 7th and 11th December. In the Tanjore district the rainfall continued with occasional breaks till the 28th December, the heaviest rainfall being recorded on the 23rd and 24th. There was also heavy rainfall in the South Arcot district during the last week of the month.

The maximum recorded in the Tinnevelly district was 7·87 inches on the 10th December. By 5-30 p.m. on that day the water in the Tambaraparni reached a height of 29 feet above the bed level in Tinnevelly town. There were a number of breaches in the river, the taluk that suffered worst in this respect being Srivaikuntam. Fortunately the floods began in daylight and precautions were taken to prevent any serious loss of life and destruction of movable property.

In the Tanjore district the rainfall recorded on the 24th was 9·35 inches at Tranquebar, 10·32 inches at Nannilam, 14·44 inches at Negapatam, 14·62 inches at Tiruppundi and 13·60 inches at Vedaranniyam. A number of breaches occurred in the rivers of the Vennar system. The rainfall was however confined to the delta and the uplands and the situation was fortunately not aggravated as in 1930 by rains in the basin of the Cauvery.

The area principally affected in the South Arcot district by the floods in the second week of December was Cuddalore town and the adjacent coastal area. The portion of the district to the south of the Pennar also suffered though less severely. The rains in the last week of December mainly affected Chidambaram taluk.

In the Trichinopoly district rainfall was particularly heavy in the taluks of Udaiyarpalaiyam, Kulittalai and Trichinopoly, the rainfall recorded on the 11th December 1931 being 9·44 inches at Ariyalur, 7·93 inches at Jayankundam and 7·28 inches at Manapparai. There was also incessant rainfall on the 23rd and 24th December in the Udaiyarpalaiyam taluk. The damage in the district was however comparatively slight.

2. (*a*) *Loss of life.*—Fourteen lives were lost in Tinnevelly. A ferry-boat plying across the Vaippar at Vilattikulam in Koilpatti taluk overturned and was carried away by the flood. Ten out of 23 passengers in the boat lost their lives. The collapse of a house in Srivaikuntam taluk accounts for one death. A beggar jumped into the water from a mantapam near the Tambaraparni and was carried away by the flood. Two corpses were washed ashore at Tuticorin; they could not be identified.

One life was lost in Tiruturaipundi taluk (Tanjore district).

In South Arcot and Trichinopoly no lives were lost.

(*b*) *Loss of cattle—Tinnevelly.*—About 675 cattle were lost, including 595 in Srivaikuntam taluk.

Tanjore.—The number lost was about 342.

South Arcot and Trichinopoly.—No damage to livestock has been reported.

2nd August 1932]

(c) *Damage to houses—Tinnevelly.*—Five thousand one hundred and eighty-nine families were rendered homeless in the taluks of Ambasamudram, Srivaikuntam, Tinnevelly and Tiruchendur. The number in Srivaikuntam taluk alone is 4,013. The people affected were mostly labourers.

Tanjore.—The number of houses damaged is 1,234.

South Arcot.—The number of families rendered homeless was 140.

3. *Damage to property—(a) Government property—*(i) *Irrigation works—Tinnevelly.*—The damage to Public Works Department works was considerable in Marudur Kila Kal, North Main channel and in the left bank above and below the anicut in the Srivaikuntam taluk and in the Chittar channel system in Tinnevelly taluk.

In Srivaikuntam taluk, there were 20 breaches in the left flood bank of the Tambaraparni, three of them in the villages of Srivaikuntam, Valavallan and Inam Tiruppani Chettiapathu being large ones. The Marudur Kila Kal system breached in twelve places. The bunds of the North Main channel at Eral were washed away for a length of about two miles. Breaches occurred in both the old and the new flood-banks in Kilappidagai Appankoil and water entered the village to a height of 5½ feet. Thirteen tanks in the charge of the Public Works Department breached as a result of breaches in the flood-banks of the river. Eighteen breaches occurred in the Srivaikuntam Periyakulam tank.

In Tiruchendur taluk there was a small breach in the right flood-bank of the Tambaraparni. The flood-banks in Athinathapuram and Inam Sedukkuvaithan were eroded. There were three breaches in the Athur channel.

Two tanks in the Tinnevelly taluk breached on account of the heavy rains on the 10th November. The breaches have been closed.

The total extent of damages to Public Works Department works is estimated at Rs. 2,18,000.

As many as 143 minor irrigation works under the control of the Revenue Department were effected. The cost of closing the breaches is estimated at Rs. 25,000.

Tanjore.—The damage in the Cauvery system was not serious. The amount required for closing the breaches and repairing the flood damage is estimated at Rs. 7,200.

The damage in the Vennar system (as usual in a north-east monsoon flood) was more serious. In addition to scours and overwashings, many rivers in the system breached in several places. There were 73 breaches in all in the Vennar, Vettar, Vadavar, Odambokiyar, Korayar, Pamaniyar and Pandavayar and as many as 103 breaches in the Adappar. The Vedaranniyam canal breached in six places.

In the Pattukkottai taluk, breaches occurred in the Periyakottai and Olayakunnam tanks and the bunds of two tanks were badly eroded.

The cost of closing the breaches is estimated at Rs. 86,000.

The total number of minor irrigation works in the charge of the Revenue Department in which there were breaches is 57. The estimated cost of closing these breaches is Rs. 12,250.

South Arcot.—Breaches occurred in 12 tanks in the charge of the Public Works Department and in 41 minor irrigation tanks. There were also breaches in the Vadavar bank and the Budangudi channel in Chidambaram. The cost of repairs is estimated at Rs. 20,150.

Trichinopoly.—Two tanks and four major irrigation channels in the charge of the Public Works Department and 15 minor irrigation tanks breached. The cost of repairing the minor irrigation tanks has been estimated at Rs. 3,500.

(ii) *Other property—Tinnevelly.*—The loss on account of the collapse of compound walls, cattle-pounds and village chavadis is estimated at Rs. 500. In Tiruchendur taluk, paths under the control of Government and not vested in local boards have been badly scoured. The estimated cost of repair is Rs. 600.

Tanjore.—There was very little damage to Government property, but some roads were damaged in the Arantangi and Mayavaram taluks.

South Arcot and Trichinopoly.—No serious losses have been reported.

(*b*) *Private property*—(i) *Crops—Tinnevelly.*—An extent of 1,445 acres has been badly silted up in Srivaikuntam taluk and the cost of reclamation is estimated at Rs. 96,000. In addition, the standing crops on an extent of about 4,650 acres were damaged and ripe paddy crop was lost on account of submersion on an extent of 1,915 acres. In other taluks the damage was comparatively light. The total loss in the district on account of damage to standing crops is estimated at Rs. 1,31,000.

Tanjore.—The total extent on which the crops were spoiled is about 20,000 acres. The largest extent affected was in Tiruturaipundi taluk where the damage was extensive and serious.

The area silted up was however insignificant, being only 13 acres.

South Arcot.—Crops on about 200 acres in Chidambaram taluk were destroyed by submersion. Paddy and sugarcane were affected to some extent in Chidambaram and Cuddalore taluks, but the outturn has been fair.

Trichinopoly.—About 3,000 acres of wet land in Kulittalai, Trichinopoly and Udaiyarpalaiyam taluks were submerged, but as there was no rainfall after the 11th, water drained away quickly and no great damage was caused. The area silted up is 30·31 acres.

(ii) *Other property—Tinnevelly.*—The damage to houses is estimated at Rs. 1,90,000.

South Arcot.—Substantial houses did not suffer. A number of huts were affected.

2nd August 1932]

4. *Measures of immediate relief—Tinnevelly.*—A number of beggars were trapped in a mantapam some 70 yards from the bank of the Tambaraparni which became isolated owing to the rise of the water in the river. They were too far out for a rope to be thrown to them. There was no boat and a raft that was specially constructed could not reach them. Three men jumped into the river. Two were carried to safety and were rescued, but the third was drowned. The rest of the party spent the night on the roof of the mantapam and were rescued at 5 p.m. the next day.

Free grants of palmyras and forest minor produce for rebuilding houses were sanctioned to a number of homeless and deserving people in Srivaikuntam and Tinnevelly taluks. A sum of Rs. 269 was granted by the Collector to 68 persons, mostly women and men incapable of labour, to enable them to hire labour for rebuilding their houses. The Tahsildar of Srivaikuntam has laid out convenient plots on rising ground in Karungulam village for the people of Adithanallur village. A flood relief committee was formed at Srivaikuntam and a district flood relief fund has been opened. A variety entertainment was organized on 9th January 1932 in aid of the fund and a sum of about Rs. 850 was realized. The rebuilding of houses is proceeding rapidly.

Remission of land revenue will be granted under the rules in the Board's Standing Orders. The anticipated remission is Rs. 33,000.

Tanjore.—No measures were urgently needed. The owners of the houses which were destroyed or damaged by the floods have taken steps to reconstruct them. Loans under the Loans Acts will be given wherever necessary.

The anticipated remission of revenue is Rs. 76,694. The Government have sanctioned the following special concessions for lands on which a crop had not been harvested previously during the fasli in Tiruturaipundi taluk:—

(1) Remission of full assessment in the case of total loss of crop on a whole survey number or subdivision;

(2) remission of full assessment where the outturn is not in excess of two annas; and

(3) remission of a third of the demand where the outturn is above 2 annas and not more than 4 annas. The grant of similar concessions in Mannargudi and Nannilam taluks is under consideration.

South Arcot.—Twenty-one applications for loans for rebuilding houses were received and 10 loans covering an amount of Rs. 395 were granted up to 20th February 1932. Free grants of timber and leaves valued at Rs. 575 were made for the same purpose. The anticipated remission of revenue is Rs. 1,100.

Trichinopoly.—No measures of immediate relief were needed. The remission to be granted is estimated at Rs. 100 to Rs. 125.

17

[2nd August 1932

5. *Repair of irrigation works—Tinnevelly.*—The breaches in the minor irrigation tanks were closed temporarily by ring-bunds and water was stored for the standing crops. The minor irrigation staff is busy preparing estimates for repairs.

South Arcot.—Six branches in Tirukkoyilur and Cuddalore divisions and all the breaches in Chidambaram division except in the Vadavar were closed by the Government. The breaches in the Vadavar were closed by kudimaramat. Several breaches were also closed permanently or temporarily by private agency.

Trichinopoly.—Steps were taken to preserve water for the irrigation of standing crops by forming ring-bunds and closing breaches wherever possible.

The repairs to the irrigation works in the charge of both the Revenue and the Public Works Department will be carried out as early as possible.

6. *Restoration of communications—Tinnevelly.*—The portions of the roads in the municipalities of Palamcottah and Tinnevelly which were damaged have been temporarily repaired and restored for traffic. The District Board has sanctioned a sum of about Rs. 50,000 towards road repair works. The Local Fund Department is making rapid progress in the repair of roads in all parts of the district. The question of making a grant to the District Board for the repair of roads and bridges is under consideration.

Tanjore.—The Collector has addressed the District Board, Tanjore, and the Taluk Board, Mayavaram, in the matter of the rapid execution of necessary repairs.

General.—On the whole the flood damage in Tinnevelly was not widespread but intensive in a few villages. The district is subject to periodical floods in the Tambaraparni river. Loss of household property was mostly confined to villages situated within flood banks or in low-lying places, and the Collector is discouraging the re-occupation of such sites. The Public Works Department proposes to investigate the possibility of improving the mouth of the Tambaraparni into the sea and making it more efficient.

In Tanjore the floods were almost entirely due to local rainfall and were much less extensive than in 1930. A study of the statistics of rainfall at the various stations in the district is being made, with a view to considering to what extent the flood-banks in the Vennar system have to be further strengthened and raised.

Various measures have been taken in the past to mitigate the effects of the Gadilam floods in the South Arcot district and it is due to these measures that the floods resulting from the unprecedented rainfall of $20\frac{1}{2}$ inches in 25 hours occasioned no loss of life and only slight damage to property. Only two areas were seriously submerged—(1) a group of villages including Sarvorajanpettai and Naduthittu and (2) the area round the village of Killai both in Chidambaram taluk. The latter is

2nd August 1932]

a low-lying flat area close to the coast and there seems to be no practicable remedy to prevent its being submerged in case of a heavy rainfall. The submersion of the former area was due partly to the failure of the ryots to repair the flood-bank of the Vellagal odai and partly to the obstruction of the course of the odai by the inadequate ventways in a local board bridge on the Edayur road. The questions of repairing the flood-bank and improving the bridge are engaging the attention of the Collector.

The Government desire to record their appreciation of the good work done by officials and non-officials in relieving distress and repairing damage.

J. A. THORNE,
Secretary to Government.

APPENDIX XI.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 99 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. NOTE No. 10392 A-2, DATED 19TH MAY 1932.

With reference to the answer given to Question No. 1056 in the Legislative Council on the 24th March 1932, the following information is laid on the table of the House:—

Legislative Council Question No. 1056.

1401 *Q*.—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that there was a lathi charge on peaceful Congress processionists in Rajapalayam on 13th February 1932; if so, how many were injured;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that they were treated in the local hospital; if so, whether the Government will be pleased to call for a copy of the accident register relating to their injuries;

(*c*) whether after the medical treatment was over the volunteers were taken from the hospital by the Police in a bus and left four miles north of Rajapalayam in a jungle;

(*d*) whether it is a fact that when about 8 p.m. they returned and were passing the Police station, the Circle Inspector of Police ordered them to run and on failure threatened to beat them;

(*e*) whether it is a fact that one Mr. I. B. Rangaswami Raju, who could not run owing to the severe injuries, was pulled and thrashed severely by the policemen till he became unconscious; and

[2nd August 1932

(*f*) whether he was again treated by the local Government doctor; if so, whether the Government will be pleased to call for a statement from the doctor regarding the injuries, their number and nature.

A.—(*a*) On 13th February 1932, a batch of six volunteers took out a procession and collected a crowd. The assembly was declared unlawful and the processionists were asked to disperse. On their refusal, they were dispersed by force. Immediately after, another batch of seven volunteers took out a procession and on their refusal to disperse when ordered to do so they were dispersed by force. All the thirteen volunteers received simple injuries.

(*b*) Yes. As all the injuries were simple they were not entered in the accident register.

(*c*) Yes; but not in a jungle.

(*d*) The thirteen volunteers returned to Rajapalayam and with about a dozen more volunteers passed in procession in front of the Police station at about 7-15 p.m. shouting civil disobedience slogans. They refused to disperse when ordered to do so and were therefore dispersed by force.

(*e*) The volunteer in question received some cuts during the dispersal and fell to the ground. He was not pulled and thrashed by the police till he became unconscious.

(*f*) Yes. The doctor's report shows that the volunteer received about a dozen "bruised stripes" all of a simple nature on his back, thigh, arms, legs and ankles and that he was conscious.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office.

TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

APPENDIX XII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 99 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 4196-3, dated 23rd May 1932.

With reference to the answer given to clause (*a*) of question No. 1252 in the Legislative Council on the 24th March 1932, the following additional information is laid on the table of the House:—

The total expenditure incurred on feeding the Police in South Kanara district on account of the civil disobedience movement up to the end of March 1932 is Rs. 1,863–10–3.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office.

2nd August 1932]

APPENDIX XIII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 100 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. NOTE No. 8836-2, DATED 23RD MAY 1932.

With reference to the answer given to question No. 1103 in the Legislative Council on the 23rd March 1932, the following information is placed on the table of the House:—

Q.—Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether on the evening of the 17th January 1932, Nagi Reddi was beaten in Pamarru with lathis for hoisting a national flag, and if so, why he was subjected to blows, without being placed before a Magistrate for trial for any offence he may have committed?

A.—No person by name Nagi Reddi was beaten by the Police on the 17th January 1932. One Tammareddi Nagareddi received some injuries on 15th January 1932 at Pamarru during the forcible dispersal of an unlawful assembly collected by him and others as a demonstration in connexion with the civil disobedience movement. It is not true that the man was beaten for hoisting a 'national' flag.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office.

APPENDIX XIV.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 100 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 10280-2, dated the 23rd May 1932.

With reference to the answer to clauses (*c*) and (*d*) of question No. 1112 given in the Legislative Council on 24th March 1932, the following information is laid on the table of the House:—

(*c*) how long were these ladies (Srimathis A. Ushamani and T. Kousalya Devi) kept in the hospital as in-patients; and

(*d*) when were they discharged?

A.—(*c*) & (*d*) The two ladies were admitted into the hospital on 22nd February 1932 and discharged on 23rd February 1932.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office.

[2nd August 1932

APPENDIX XV.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 100 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 10353-2, *dated 25th May* 1932.

With reference to the answer given in the Legislative Council to Question No. 1057 on the 19th March 1932, the following information is laid on the table of the House:—

1057 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that A. V. Kunhambu and M. V. Chindan Nayar were taken to the Police station on their refusal to cease picketing Ramachandra Maliga & Son's cloth shop in Kasargod on 7th March 1932, and beaten by the Police with hands and canes and subsequently taken into the lock-up where they were beaten by the Sub-Inspector with cane and then pushed out;

(*b*) whether, when they again returned to picket, they were again taken to the station and similarly beaten by the Police and the Sub-Inspector;

(*c*) whether they were taken walking about 1 a.m. (after midnight) by the Police to a house about five miles away and then left there; and

(*d*) whether it is a fact that all the while they were made to starve?

A.—(*a*) The two persons were taken to the Police station as they refused to go away from the scene of picketing. On their giving a verbal undertaking not to picket again they were released. They were not beaten in the Police station. They were in fact detained in the Police station for only 15 minutes and were not put into the lock-up at all.

(*b*) In violation of their undertaking the two persons again picketed the same shop after release whereupon the Police arrested and took them to the station. They were not beaten by the Police. They were released again at about 7 p.m.

(*c*) On their release the two persons were allowed to go where they wished. They walked for about 4 miles and entered a private house.

(*d*) The two persons were in custody between the hours of 4-30 and 7 p.m. only. There was no need to provide food for them during this short period.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office.

2nd August 1932]

Appendix XVI.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 100 supra.]

List of posts on Rs. 500 per mensem and above created during the quarter ending 31st March 1932.

A.—PERMANENT.

Nil.

B. TEMPORARY.

(i) Extension of previous sanction.

General Administration.

Department and designation of post.	Pay per mensem.	Period of tenure.	Remarks.
Public (Services) Department—			
Assistant Secretary, Law (Drafting).	RS. 500—50—800	For six months from 30th January 1932.	The post was sanctioned to relieve the Under Secretary, Law (Drafting) Department, for six months from 30th July 1931 and extended for six months up to 30th January 1932 and now further extended for six months.
Administration of Justice.			
Law (General) Department—			
Additional Sub-Judge, Tanjore.	650	One year from 1st January 1932.	
Additional District Munsif, Bellary.	Grade pay in the I.C.S.	One month from 1st March 1932.	For the judicial training of Mr. P. Rajagopalan, I.C.S.

(ii) Posts newly created.

General Administration.

Department and designation of post.	Pay per mensem.	Period of tenure.	Remarks.
Public (Services) Department—			
Additional Secretary to Government in the Chief Secretariat.	Pay in the senior scale of the I.C.S. plus Presidency Allowance of Rs. 100.	From 4th January 1932 to 20th March 1932.	Mr. T. G. Rutherford, I.C.S., was appointed to the post.
Public (Special) Department—			
Additional Under Secretary to Government in the Public Department.	Pay in the junior time-scale of the I.C.S. plus Rs. 200 Special pay.	From 12th January 1932 to 26th January 1932 (inclusive).	Mr. D. H. Elwin, I.C.S., was appointed to the post.
Officer on special duty in the Chief Secretariat.	Pay in the junior time-scale of the I.C.S.	From 19th February 1932 to 24th March 1932.	Mr. H. Trevelyan, I.C.S., was appointed to the special duty.

TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

[2nd August 1932

B. TEMPORARY—*cont.*

(ii) Posts newly created—*cont.*

General Administration—cont.

Department and designation of post.	Pay per mensem.	Period of tenure.	Remarks.
Public (Special) Department—			
	RS.		
Additional Under Secretary to Government in the Public Department.	Grade pay of a Deputy Collector plus Rs. 200 Special pay.	From 3rd March 1932 to 12th April 1932.	M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur A. A. Venkatarama Ayyar Avargal was appointed to the post.
Collector	2,750	From 20th January 1932 to 11th April 1932.	M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur U. Rama Rao Avargal was appointed to be on special duty as a nominated member of the Legislative Assembly.
Administration of Justice.			
Public (Special) Department—			
Additional District and Sessions Judge, Guntur.	Pay in the senior time-scale of the I.C.S.	From 15th January 1932 to 8th April 1932.	Mr. A. S. Panchapagesa Ayyar, I.C.S., was appointed to the post.
Additional Sessions Judge, East Godavari.	Do.	From 1st February 1932 to 29th February 1932.	M.R.Ry. T. Bhujanga Rao Avargal was appointed to the post.
Civil works.			
Public Works and Labour Department—			
Executive Engineer.	625—1,375	From 15th January 1932 to 31st March 1934.	For the Kattalai Special Division. Originally sanctioned for two years from 8th April 1931. The division was abolished in September 1931 and revived from 15th January 1932 in G.O. No. 144 I., dated 18th January 1932.

S. A. Venkataraman,
Deputy Secretary to Government,
Finance Department.

2nd August 1932]

Appendix XVII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 100 supra.]

G.O. No. 266, Finance, dated 4th May 1932.

The Public Accounts Committee and the Standing Finance Committee of the Legislative Council for the year 1932–33 will be constituted as follows:—

A. Public Accounts Committee.

Nominated by His Excellency the Governor.

1. The Hon'ble the Finance Member (*Chairman*).
2. A. W. Hutton, Esq., M.L.C.
3. M.R.Ry. T. Sundara Rao Nayudu Garu, M.L.C.

Elected by the Non-official members of the Council.

4. M.R.Ry. D. V. Narasimhaswami Garu, M.L.C.
5. Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur, M.L.C.
6. M.R.Ry. P. V. Rajagopala Pillai Avargal, M.L.C.
7. B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur, M.L.C.
8. M.R.Ry. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti Garu, M.L.C.
9. M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar Avargal, M.L.C.
10. M.R.Ry. M. Devadasan Avargal, M.L.C.

B. Standing Finance Committee.

Nominated by His Excellency the Governor.

1. The Hon'ble the Finance Member (*Chairman*).
2. M.R.Ry. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar Avargal, M.L.C.
3. M.R.Ry. C. Basu Dev Avargal, M.L.C.

Elected by the Non-official members of the Council.

4. M.R.Ry. A. B. Shetty Avargal, M.L.C.
5. F. E. James, Esq., M.L.C.
6. Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri (Raja Velugoti Sarvagnya Kumarakrishna Yachendrula Varu), M.L.C.
7. Zamindar of Mirzapuram (Mirzapuram Raja alias Venkataramayya Appa Rao Garu), M.L.C.
8. M.R.Ry. Rao Sahib V. I. Munuswami Pillai Avargal, M.L.C.
9. Khan Bahadur Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur, M.L.C.
10. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar Avargal, M.L.C.
11. M.R.Ry. R. M. Palat Avargal, M.L.C.

(By order of the Governor in Council)

S. A. Venkataraman,
Deputy Secretary to Government.

To all Departments of the Secretariat.
,, the Accountant-General, Madras.
,, all Secretaries to Government.
,, all members of the Public Accounts and Finance Committees.
,, the Secretary to the Legislative Council (for communication to the members of the Legislative Council).

[2nd August 1932

Appendix XVIII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 100 supra.]

G.O. No. 1944, L. & M., dated 27th May 1932.

Read—the following papers:—

G.O. No. 1114, L. & M., dated 23rd March 1932.
G.O. No. 1884, L. & M., dated 23rd May 1932.

Order—No. 1944, *L. & M., dated 27th May* 1932.

The Government, on receipt of further information from the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards, find that the elections to all the panchayats that were union boards on the 25th August 1930, other than those mentioned in the appendix to G.O. No. 1884, L. & M., dated the 23rd May 1932, cannot be completed before the 31st May 1932 as stated in the order. A short extension of time has thus become inevitable.

2. In exercise of the power conferred by rule 6 (1) (b) of the schedule to the Madras Local Boards (Amendment) Act, 1930, the Government are therefore pleased to postpone the date fixed in G.O. No. 1114, L. & M., dated the 23rd March 1932, for the retirement of members of all panchayats that were unions on the 25th August 1930, other than those mentioned in the appendix to G.O. No. 1884, L. & M., dated the 23rd May 1932, and for the coming into office of the newly elected members and to fix the following dates in lieu thereof:—

Tinnevelly district— Sivagiri. Eruvadi. Kayalpatnam. Udangudi. Tanjore district— Nannilam. Guntur district— Tadikonda. South Arcot district— Vadakkanandal.	30th June 1932.
All other panchayats.	10th June 1932.

3. This order will not apply to panchayats which have been superseded for specified periods.

(By order of the Government, Ministry of Local Self-Government)

E. Conran Smith,
Secretary to Government.

To all Presidents of District Boards, with copies for Presidents of Panchayat Boards (ex-unions).
,, all Presidents of Taluk Boards.
,, the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards.
,, all Deputy Inspectors of Municipal Councils.
,, all District Election Officers.
,, all Collectors.
,, the Secretary to the Legislative Council for placing the order on the table of the Legislative Council.

Copy to the Revenue Department.

2nd August 1932]

Appendix XIX.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 100 supra.]

G.O. No. 2132, L. & M., dated 8th June 1932.

Read—the following paper:—

G.O. No. 1944, L. & M., dated 27th May 1932.

Order—No. 2132, *L. & M., dated* 8th *June* 1932.

In G.O. No. 1944, L. & M., dated the 27th May 1932, the Government fixed the 10th June 1932 for the retirement of the existing members of the Manamadurai Panchayat, besides others, and for the coming into office of the newly elected members. As the elections to the panchayat will not be completed before the 10th June, a short postponement of the date has become necessary. In exercise of the power conferred by rule 6 (1) (*b*) of the Schedule to the Madras Local Boards (Amendment) Act, 1930, the Government accordingly postpone the date fixed in G.O. No. 1944, L. & M., dated 27th May 1932, and fix the 30th June 1932, in lieu thereof.

(By order of the Government, Ministry of Local Self-Government)

E. Conran Smith,
Secretary to Government.

To the President, Panchayat Board, Manamadurai.
" President, Taluk Board, Sivaganga.
" President, District Board, Ramnad.
" Collector of Ramnad.
" Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards.
" Deputy Inspector of Municipal Councils, Trichinopoly.
" District Election Officer, Ramnad.
" Secretary, Legislative Council, for placing the order on the table of the Legislative Council.

Appendix XX.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 100 supra.]

Public (General) Department.

U.O. Note No. 8832-3, dated the 30th May 1932.

With reference to the answer given to question No. 1102 in the Legislative Council on the 23rd March 1932, the following information is laid on the Table of the House:—

* 1102 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether Messrs. Meka Adinarayana Nimmoyadda Venkatakrishnayya and G. Suryaprakasa Rao who were distributing leaflets on different occasions were taken to Robertsonpeta Police station (Kistna district), beaten with lathis in the Police lock-up and let off; and

[2nd August 1932

(*b*) if so, why they were not proceeded against in a court of law for any offence that they may have committed, instead of being beaten with lathis?

A.—(*a*) None of them was taken to the Police station and beaten.
(*b*) Does not arise.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

APPENDIX XXI.

[*Vide* item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 *supra*.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 8835-1, dated the 30th May 1932.

With reference to the answer to question No. 1075 given in the Legislative Council on the 21st March 1932, the following information is placed on the Table of the House:—

* 1075 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether Rami Reddi, Subba Reddi and two others of Kaja, which is about ten miles from Masulipatam, were arrested for taking part in a meeting, and afterwards instead of being proceeded against in a court of law, were beaten with lathis in the Robertsonpeta lock-up, and whether Subba Reddi received an injury on the head as the result of the beating?

A.—No persons of the names given were taken to the Robertsonpeta lock-up and no one was beaten in the lock-up.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

APPENDIX XXII.

[*Vide* item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 *supra*.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 10129-2, dated the 30th May 1932.

With reference to the answer to question No. 1100 given in the Legislative Council on the 23rd March 1932, the following information is placed on the Table of the House:—

* 1100 *Q.*—Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government are aware that on the 25th February last at 10 a.m. Congress volunteers Messrs. Pitchai Kone and Devendra Kone when distributing Congress notices near Krishnagar, Teppakulam in Madura, were arrested and taken to No. 2 Police station;

2nd August 1932]

(*b*) whether it is a fact that they were kept in custody from 11 a.m. on the 25th to 6-30 p.m. on the 26th February without being provided with food even once during the whole period and that they were not even allowed to get their food themselves; and

(*c*) whether it is a fact that they were threatened and beaten and compelled to state who published the notices and where they were published?

A.—(*a*) The persons in question were found distributing unauthorized news-sheets containing Congress literature. They were arrested and taken to the Police station with a view to prevent the continuance of the offence. They were not put into the lock-up.

(*b*) They were in the station premises from about 10-30 a.m. to 7-20 p.m. on the 25th. They were not in the lock-up and so were at liberty to procure their own food but apparently preferred not to do so.

(*c*) They were questioned as to the source of the unauthorized news-sheets but were not threatened or beaten.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

APPENDIX XXIII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 10592-2, dated the 30th May 1932.

With reference to the answer given to question No. 1120 in the Council on the 24th March 1932, the following information is placed on the Table of the House:—

* 1120 *Q.*—Mr. K. R. VENKATARAMA AYYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether a picketer Ayyasami who was not a member of an unlawful assembly was severely beaten by the Police in the City of Madura early in January and after he was disabled and prostrated the Police Sub-Inspector beat him further when he was lying on the ground unable to move and also kicked him with his boot-heel on his chest and ribs;

[2nd August 1932

(*b*) whether this instance was taken to the notice of the District Magistrate and the District Superintendent of Police soon after it occurred and whether they were satisfied that it was a case of unwarranted use of force and of excessive force; and

(*c*) whether any disciplinary action has been taken against or punishment awarded to the Sub-Inspector concerned; if not, why not?

A.—(*a*), (*b*) & (*c*) The Government understand that the hon. Member made the allegation informally to the District Magistrate and the District Superintendent of Police. The picketer Ayyaswami may have been beaten in the course of the dispersal of one of the unlawful assemblies of picketers which had to be dispersed forcibly in Madura early in January, but no complaint was made by him of the use of excessive force. In the absence of any attempt to substantiate the allegations, the District Magistrate took no further proceedings.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

APPENDIX XXIV.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 8835-2, dated the 31st May 1932.

With reference to the answer given to question No. 1074 in the Legislative Council on the 21st March 1932, the following further information is placed on the table of the House:—

Mikilineni Ramakotayya was concerned in the harbouring of volunteers from the Komaravolu Sibiram. He was sent for on 16th January 1932, whereupon a large crowd came towards the Police in a threatening attitude. They were therefore declared an unlawful assembly and were ordered to disperse. As they refused to do so, they were dispersed by force; Ramakotayya was in the crowd and received some lathi blows during the dispersal. He was not beaten for hoisting a national flag or for showing hospitality to congress people.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

2nd August 1932]

APPENDIX XXV.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 8839-2, dated 4th June 1932.

With reference to the answer to Question No. 1101 answered in the Legislative Council on the 23rd March 1932, the following information is laid on the table of the House.

* 1101 *Q.*—Rai Sahib C. KOLANDA REDDI: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether Srimathis Cherukururi Veeyamma and two other lady volunteers picketed the toddy shop of Kommunur village, Gudivada taluk, Kistna district, on the 14th February 1932;

(*b*) whether the Police splashed them with coloured water on that day;

(*c*) whether on the 15th idem the Police poured toddy over their heads in addition to drenching them with coloured water;

(*d*) whether on the next day (16th February 1932) while repeating the above process, the Police indulged in insulting and obscene language;

(*e*) whether on the 17th idem the Police poured coloured water over their heads, removing sarees therefrom;

(*f*) whether on the 18th the Police poured tar mixed with marking-nut juice; and

(*g*) what action the Government have taken, or will take, against the offending Policemen?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) *to* (*f*) Coloured water was directed on the volunteers. It is not true that toddy or tar was used. The Police did not remove sarees from the heads of the women or insult them.

(*g*) The use of coloured water has been discontinued. No further action is required.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

[2nd August 1932

APPENDIX XXVI.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 10136-2, dated the 4th June 1932.

With reference to the answer to Question No. 1176 given in the Legislative Council on the 24th March 1932, the following information is laid on the table of the House:—

1176 *Q.*—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that certain gentlemen were sent for by the Police Commissioner immediately prior to the arrival of the Indian Franchise Committee at Madras and when the said persons went to the Commissioner's office they were at once locked up, and have been kept under confinement ever since;

(*b*) if so, under what provision of the law this was done and how many such persons were locked up, and for what period; and

(*c*) whether the Government propose to enquire into the illegality or otherwise of this procedure?

A.—(*a*) No.

(*b*) & (*c*) Do not arise.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

APPENDIX XXVII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 10092-3, dated 17th June 1932.

With reference to the answer given to Question No. 1121 in the Legislative Council on the 24th March 1932, the following information is placed on the table of the House:—

1121 *Q.*—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) how many persons were arrested in the City of Madras just prior to and after the arrival of the Indian Franchise Committee at Madras in connexion with the Civil Disobedience Movement;

(*b*) how many of them are still under remand and how many have been released;

(*c*) against how many of these are prosecutions launched or intended to be launched, and for what offence and under what code;

(*d*) how many of these were originally arrested under warrant and how many without a warrant; and

2nd August 1932]

(*e*) what the procedure adopted was in the case of those who were not arrested under warrant?

A.—(*a*) 70.

(*b*) Still under remand—Nil.

Released on 27th February 1932		12
,, 29th February 1932		6
,, 4th March 1932		5
,, 5th March 1932		5
,, 9th March 1932		15
,, 11th March 1932		7
Released on apology		11

(*c*) Nine persons were prosecuted under section 17 (1) of the Indian Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1908.

(*d*) & (*e*) All were arrested without warrant under section 17 of the Indian Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1908. Nine were prosecuted and convicted. The remainder were released, some on their expressing regret, others because they were persons of no status for whom a warning by the Commissioner was sufficient.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office.

APPENDIX XXVIII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 9462/2, dated the 20th June 1932.

With reference to the answer to the supplementary question to Question No. 1237 given in the Legislative Council on 24th March 1932, the signatories of the complaint are given below:—

(1) U. Mesha Rao, Pleader, Kasaragod.
(2) K. Sundar Rama Shetty, Vakil.
(3) K. Krishna Bhat, Vakil.
(4) Th. Devadar Shenoy, Vakil, Kasaragod.
(5) M. G. Ganesh Narayana Pai, Advocate.
(6) K. Ganesh Rao, Vakil, Kasaragod.
(7) C. M. Kamath, Vakil, Kasaragod.

(8) C. Rama Rao, Pleader, Kasaragod.
(9)
(10) } Illegible.
(11) M. Panduranga Rao, Hosdrug.
(12) V. V. Kamath, Insurance Agent, Kunhangad.
(13) Illegible.
(14) K. Madhava Naik, Insurance Agent, Kunhangad.
(15) H. Janardhan Kamath, Kunhangad.
(16) Illegible, merchants, Hosdrug.
(17) K. Keshav Pai, Merchant, Kasaragod.
(18) U. Miltal Bhandari, Merchant, Hosdrug.
(19) A. Vittal Kamath, son of H. Raghunath Kamath.
(20) K. Vamana, Upendra, Shenoy, Merchant, Kunhangad.
(21) Illegible.
(22) K. Sreedhara Srinivasa Shenoy, Merchant, Kunhangad.
(23) K. Madhava Srinivas Kamath, Katcheri.
(24) H. Sitharama Maiya, Vakil, Kasaragod.
(25) Illegible, Vakil, Kasaragod.

G. T. H. Bracken,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office.

Appendix XXIX.

[*Vide* item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

Public (General) Department.

U.O. Note No. 10783-2, dated the 20th June 1932.

With reference to the answer to the Legislative Council Question No. 1259 given on 24th March 1932, the following further information is placed on the Table of the House:—

1259 *Q.*—Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether it is a fact that on the 16th January 1932, the Subdivisional Magistrate, Gudivada, sent for one Mikkilaneni Akkayya of Pedamaddali and assaulted him with lathi for celebrating the flag day on the 14th January 1932?

A.—The allegation that the Subdivisional Magistrate sent for one Mikkilaneni Akkayya of Pedamaddali on 16th January 1932 and assaulted him with a lathi for celebrating the flag day on the 14th January 1932 is untrue. The facts are as follows:—

On the 16th January the Subdivisional Magistrate went with Reserve Police to Pedamaddali. There was some

disturbance in connexion with the arrest of Mikkilaneni Ramakotayya, and the Police had to use their lathis. Possibly this man Akkayya was one of the crowd who was injured during the lathi charge. He is unknown to the Subdivisional Magistrate.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office.

APPENDIX XXX.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 10818-2, dated the 20th June 1932.

With reference to the answer to Question No. 1258 given on 24th March 1932, the following further information is placed on the Table of the House:—

* 1258 *Q.*—Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the Subdivisional Magistrate, Gudivada, went to Pamarru on the 15th January 1932 with a posse of police and sent for one Tamala Nagireddi and Painamaneni Pattabhiramayya and assaulted them with sticks and canes?

A.—The allegation that the Subdivisional Magistrate sent for one Tamala Nagireddi and Painamaneni Pattabhiramayya at Pamarru and assaulted them with sticks and canes is not correct. The facts are as follows:—

On the 15th January the Subdivisional Magistrate accompanied the Reserve Police and the Circle Inspector to Pamarru. There one Tammareddi Nagireddi and others were arranging to carry out some demonstration in furtherance of civil disobedience and, as they refused to disperse when ordered to do so, they were dispersed by a lathi charge. Tammareddi Nagireddi received some lathi blows in course of the dispersal. Possibly Painamaneni Pattabhiramayya was also beaten—the Subdivisional Magistrate does not know him.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office.

[2nd August 1932

Appendix XXXI.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

G.O. No. 2482, L. & M., dated 27th June 1932.

In G.Os. No. 1884, L. & M., dated the 23rd May 1932 and No. 1944, L. & M., dated the 27th May 1932, Government fixed the date for the retirement of members of panchayats which were unions on the 25th August 1930 and for the coming into office of the newly elected members as the 10th June 1932 in some cases and the 30th June 1932 in others. As the necessary preliminaries for the conduct of elections to some panchayats could not be completed in time, a short postponement has become unavoidable in their case.

2. In exercise of the power conferred by rule 6 (1) (*b*) of the Schedule to the Madras Local Boards (Amendment) Act, 1930, the Government are pleased to postpone the date fixed in G.Os. No. 1884, L. & M., dated the 23rd May 1932 and No. 1944, L. & M., dated the 27th May 1932, for the retirement of the members of the panchayats mentioned in the appendix to this order and for the coming into office of the newly elected members and to fix the 31st July 1932 in lieu thereof.

(By order of the Government, Ministry of Local Self-Government)

E. Conran Smith,
Secretary to Government.

To the Presidents of District Boards concerned with copies for Presidents of Panchayat Boards.
,, Presidents of Taluk Boards concerned.
,, Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards.
,, Deputy Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards.
,, District Election Officers concerned.
,, Collectors concerned.
,, Secretary, Legislative Council, for placing the order on the table of the Legislative Council.
Copy to Revenue Department.

Appendix.

Tanjore District.

1. Valangiman.
2. Tirukattupalli.
3. Vedaranniyam.
4. Kodavasal.
5. Nannilam.
6. Pattukkottai.
7. Nidamangalam.
8. Melattur.
9. Tranquebar.

Madura District.

10. Kelamangalam.

Ramnad District.

11. Devipatnam.

Tinnevelly District.

12. Kadayanallur.

North Arcot District.

13. Kaveripakkam.
14. Pudupalaiyam.

South Arcot District.

15. Vadakanandal.

Salem District.

16. Jalakantapuram.

Anantapur District.

17. Dharmavaram.

East Godavari District.

18. Samalkot.
19. G. Mamidada.

West Godavari District.

20. Penukonda.

Guntur District.

21. Phringipuram.
22. Tadikonda.

2nd August 1932]

Appendix XXXII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

G.O. No. 2500, L. & M., dated 27th June 1932.

In G.O. No. 1114, L. & M., dated the 23rd March 1932, the Government fixed the 30th June 1932 for the retirement of members of district and taluk boards and for the coming into office of the newly elected members. It is now found that while elections have been held in two districts, the necessary preliminaries for the conduct of elections in others are in different stages of progress necessitating the postponement of their reconstitution to different dates. Moreover, it has not been found possible to conduct the elections to panchayats originally constituted under the Madras Village Panchayats Act, 1920, within the date fixed, viz., 30th June 1932. A short postponement of the date of reconstitution has therefore become unavoidable in their case also.

2. In exercise of the powers conferred by rule 6 (1) (*b*) of the Schedule to the Madras Local Boards (Amendment) Act, 1930, the Government are hereby pleased to postpone, in respect of the district and taluk boards and panchayats shown in the appendix to this Order, the date fixed in G.O. No. 1114, L. & M., dated the 23rd March 1932, for the retirement of the existing members and for the coming into office of the newly elected members and to fix the dates shown against them in lieu thereof.

(By order of the Government, Ministry of Local Self-Government)

E. Conran Smith,
Secretary to Government.

To all Presidents of District Boards.
,, all Presidents of Taluk Boards.
,, all Collectors.
,, the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards.
,, all Deputy Inspectors of Municipal Councils and Local Boards.
,, all District Election Officers.
,, the Secretary, Legislative Council, for placing the order on the table of the Legislative Council.
,, the Registrar, Madras University.
,, the Registrar, Andhra University.
,, the Revenue Department.

Appendix.

The Nilgiris District Board	14th July 1932.
All the taluk boards in the Chingleput district	15th July 1932.
The Chingleput District Board	22nd July 1932.
The district and taluk boards in the Madura district	31st July 1932.
All other district and taluk boards ...	31st August 1932.
All panchayats which were originally constituted under the Madras Village Panchayats Act, 1920	31st August 1932

[2nd August 1932

APPENDIX XXXIII.

[*Vide* item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 102 *supra*.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

With reference to clause (*f*) of question No. 1223 answered in the Legislative Council on the 24th March 1932 and the answer to the supplementary question thereto the following information is placed on the table of the House:—

Enquiries show that besides Mrs. Prabhu and the constables who escorted her to Vellore there were two ladies and three or four men in the compartment when the train left Tellicherry. They alighted at Calicut. Five or six other persons travelled in that compartment from Calicut as far as Shoranur. No other definite information could be obtained as to the number of passengers who travelled from Shoranur to Vellore, but as the compartment was a large one it is probable that there were several.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

27th June 1932.

APPENDIX XXXIV.

[*Vide* item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 102 *supra*.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 10276-1, dated the 18th May 1932.

With reference to the answer to clause (*b*) of question No. **1119** given in the Council on the 24th March 1932, the following information is laid on the table:—

* **1119** *Q.*—Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether he has received a written complaint, dated 25th February 1932, from one V. Padmanabha Rao, Inamdar, Ponur (Guntur district), regarding the assault by the Police causing severe injuries on the following among other persons, for disobeying orders under section 144, Indian Penal Code:—

(*a*) Mr. Seshagiri Rao on 18th February 1932 who received over 50 cuts with a hunting whip;

(*b*) Messrs. Thumulur Sivaramayya and Koteswaralu on 10th February 1932;

2nd August 1932]

(*c*) Messrs. Dasari Katiah Choudary and Suryadevara Krishniah Choudary volunteers from Nidubrole;

(*d*) Mr. Padmanabha Rao, who was beaten when going to his home; and

(*b*) if so, what action he has taken on the conduct of the Sub-Inspector and the head constable for causing such severe injuries to the persons named above as testified to by the copies of medical certificates furnished to the hon. the Home Member?

A.—The persons referred to collected large crowds in public thoroughfares on the dates mentioned and incited them to defy the laws. The crowds obstructed the traffic and behaved in a disorderly manner. They refused to disperse when ordered to do so on each occasion. After due warning they were dispersed by force. Only the minimum force required was used and the persons referred to sustained only slight injuries.

T. Sivaramayya and T. Koteswara Rao were tried and convicted under section 17 (1) of the Criminal Law Amendment Act and section 117, Indian Penal Code, by the Joint Magistrate, Ongole. They did not complain of the use of excessive force either before or at their trial. A. Seshagiri Rao preferred a complaint of hurt against the Station-house Officer in the Sub-Magistrate's Court, Ponur, in which he alleged that some of the injuries were caused by the beating he received at the hands of the Police as he was going from his house. The complaint was returned for presentation before the Joint Magistrate but A. Seshagiri Rao failed to proceed with it.

The allegation that Padmanabha Rao was beaten when going home is false. He joined his brother Seshagiri Rao in collecting the crowd on 18th February 1932 and was beaten during the dispersal of the crowd.

As A. Seshagiri Rao failed to proceed with his complaint, the Government assume that he was unable to substantiate the allegations made and do not propose to take any further action.

G. T. H. Bracken,
Chief Secretary.

Appendix XXXV.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 102 supra.]

Finance Department.

COMMUNICATION TO THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, No. 22334-ER/1, DATED 11th JULY 1932.

With reference to the answer given by the hon. the Finance Member to the question No. 394 and to the supplementary question thereto on 31st October 1931, the following statement is placed on the table:—

The Government understand as a result of enquiries made from other Provinces that their Retrenchment Committees have made no such general recommendations as those mentioned by the hon. Member either on the subject of allowances (question No. 394) or on the subject of intermediary posts (question No. 395).

In fact, the Madras Retrenchment Committee appear to have gone further in these matters than those of other Provinces.

H. M. Hood,
Secretary to Government.

Appendix XXXVI.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 102 supra.]

Public (General) Department.

U.O. Note No. 10130-2, dated the 9th June 1932.

With reference to the supplementary questions and answers given in the Legislative Council on the 24th March 1932 with reference to question No. 1220, the following information is laid on the table of the House:—

Messrs. Khasa Subba Rao and O. P. Ramaswami were not present during the enquiry held by the Commissioner of Police as they were then in-patients in the Government General Hospital.

Bus owners and drivers were asked to give evidence.

G. T. H. Bracken,
Chief Secretary.

TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

2nd August 1932]

APPENDIX XXXVII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 102 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 8837-3, dated the 9th June 1932.

With reference to the answer to question No. 1113 given in the Legislative Council on the 24th March 1932 the following information is laid on the table of the House:—

Pinnamaneni Veerayya and Gullapalli Sreeramulu received lathi blows during the dispersal of the unlawful assembly on the 15th January 1932 under the circumstances stated in the answer to the question.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

APPENDIX XXXVIII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 102 supra.]

***Statement of Action taken by the Government on Resolutions passed during the Second Session of the Fourth Madras Legislative Council,* 1931–32.**

Serial number and subject of resolution.	When passed by the Council.	Nature of action taken by the Government.
(1) This Council recommends to the Government to make an immediate enquiry and if necessary to appoint a committee of both officials and non-officials to investigate into, and to report on, the ill-treatment of the depressed classes in the Devakottai subdivision of the Ramnad district as alleged in the Memorandum submitted to Government by the President of the Ramnad District Adi-Dravida Mahajana Sabha.	4th Aug. 1931.	The Government did not consider it necessary to appoint a committee. As promised by the hon. the Home Member in the Council, copies of the speeches made in the Council on the subject were forwarded to the District Magistrate, Ramnad, and he was asked to bring together the leading members of both communities, the Kallars and the Adi-Dravidas, and to endeavour to arrive at a restoration of amicable relations between the two classes. The District Magistrate reported in November 1931, that the trouble had subsided and that the advice of Government had been noted for future guidance should there be similar disturbances in the neighbourhood.

Serial number and subject of resolution.	When passed by the Council.	Nature of action taken by the Government.
(2) Construction of an anicut across the river Ponniar (South Pennar) to divert the excess of flood and other water of the river for irrigation in Tiruvannamalai and Chengam taluks, North Arcot district.	4th Aug. 1931.	Two schemes which were considered and dropped were referred to by the hon. the Revenue Member in his speech on the resolution. As regards the other schemes mentioned, several sites for the construction of an anicut across the Ponniar were examined in 1893 and a proposal came up in 1903 for the construction of an anicut with a main channel to take off from the right bank at Kurumapattu village. The proposal was dropped as it was found that it would affect adversely the Tirukkoyilur Anicut system and irrigation lower down. Two suggestions made by M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur Arogyaswami Mudaliyar were : (1) Construction of a reservoir on the Upper Gadilam at Puttanandal with a supply channel from the Tirukkoyilur anicut and (2) Construction of a storage reservoir with a capacity of 15,000 million cubic feet at Agaram Pallipattu for extension of irrigation under the system. It was decided that the supply of water was inadequate for a successful scheme under either of these proposals. In all these cases, the chief reason for abandoning the projects suggested has been that there is not sufficient supply of water available in a very large proportion of years for a new scheme without detriment to the existing irrigation under the Tirukkoyilur anicut and below, and after supplying the needs of the area irrigated by the Nedungal anicut above. In these circumstances the Government are unable to give effect to the resolution.
(3) Condition of the Madrasis in Burma and the urgent need for taking necessary steps to safeguard their personal property, etc.	5th August 1931.	The proceedings of the Council were forwarded to the Government of India and the Government of Burma.
(4) Raising of certain Madras infantry battalions.	Do.	A copy of the proceedings of the Legislative Council on the resolution was forwarded to the Government of India, Army Department, on 29th September 1931.
(5) This Council recommends to the Government that the consideration of the proposal of the Special Settlement Officer as approved by the Board of Revenue for enhancement of assessment in Malabar be postponed until normal conditions are restored.	2nd Nov. 1931.	The Government on an examination of all the circumstances came to the conclusion that there was no justification for postponing the introduction of resettlement in the district. Orders were accordingly issued in G.O. No. 2717, Revenue, dated the 23rd December 1931, and the order was made available to the Press.

2nd August 1932]

Serial number and subject of resolution.	When passed by the Council.	Nature of action taken by the Government.
(6) Committee to enquire into the incidence of taxation on Motor Vehicles in the Madras Presidency.	2nd Nov. 1931.	In accordance with the resolution of the Legislative Council the Government appointed in G.O. No. 34, L. & M., dated 6th January 1932, a committee consisting of seven members. The Government Order was placed on the table of the House. The interim report of the committee was also placed on the table of the House on the 24th March 1932. Of the four recommendations made by the committee one has been approved by the Government and given effect to. The other recommendations are under consideration.
(7) This Council recommends to the Government that the collection of land revenue be extended over six instalments of equal amounts.	Do.	The question is under consideration.
(8) Introduction of graded cut in salaries of Government servants.	28th Jan. 1932.	No action was taken on the resolution for the reasons given by the hon. the Finance Member during the discussion.

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,
Secretary to the Council.

21*st July* 1932.

TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

தமிழ்நாடு சட்டமன்றப் பேரவை
TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS